



Sculp. G. Kneller Pinx.
BERNHARDINUS DE MOOR,
 Bernh. Fil. Barthol. Nep. Catar. ad Mosam Batavus,
 THEOLOGIE DOCTOR et PROFESSOR ORDIN.
primam FRANEQUERÆ CIOCCXLIV. dein LUGDUNI BATAV. CIOCCXLV.
 ibidemque Ecclesiæ Pastor. Ætat. XXXVI. *Quædam*
Prof. at U. of Leiden

Bernardinus de Moor's

Didactico-Electic Theology

*That is, his Continuous Commentary on Johannes
Marckius' Didactico-Elenctic Compendium of
Christian Theology*

Volume 1: Concerning the Word and Definition of Theology

Translated by Dr. Steven Dilday

**Central, South Carolina
From Reformation to Reformation Translations
2017**

Bernardinus de Moor's Didactico-Electic Theology
Copyright © 2017 Steven Dilday

Published by From Reformation to Reformation Translations
426 Patterson St., Central, SC 29630
bernardinusdemoor.com

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced without the prior written permission of the publisher, except for brief quotations for the purpose of review or comment.

Printed in the United States of America.

A revised edition of *Bernardinus de Moor's Continuous Commentary on Johannes Marckius' Didactico-Elencitic Compendium of Christian Theology: Volume 1*

CONTENTS

I. Prefatory Matter	7
Who is Bernardinus de Moor? and Why Translate His Work?	9
Dedication	13
Preface to the Benevolent Reader	17
A Survey of the Entire Work	31
II. Chapter I: Concerning the Word and Definition of Theology	35
Summary of Chapter I	37
§ 1: Etymology of “Theology”	41
§ 2: Extra-Biblical Uses of “Theology”	45
§ 3: Biblical Uses of “Theology”; and the Personal Word ...	53
§ 4: Biblical Uses of “Theology”; and the External Word ...	65
§ 5: Synonyms of “Theology”	67
§ 6: Homonyms of “Theology”	70
§ 7: Archetypal Theology	86
§ 8: Ectypal Theology: Of Union	89
§ 9: Ectypal Theology: Of Vision	95
§ 10: Ectypal Theology: Of the Race-Course	98
§ 11: The Existence of Theology of the Race-Course	101
§ 12: Natural Theology: Innate	108
§ 13: Natural Theology: Acquired	115
§ 14: Acquired Natural Theology and Universal Doubt ...	119
§ 15: The Idea of God	123
§ 16: Natural Theology before and after the Fall	129
§ 17: Defense of the Existence of Natural Theology	133
§ 18: The Object of Natural Theology	142
§ 19: The Insufficiency of Natural Theology	145

§ 20: Vindication of the Insufficiency of Natural Theology	148
§ 21: Natural and Revealed Theology Compared and Contrasted	162
§ 22: The End of Natural Theology	167
§ 23: The Necessity of Revealed Theology	168
§ 24: Habitual Revealed Theology	172
§ 25: Systematic Revealed Theology	176
§ 26: Scholastic Theology	182
§ 27: Definition of Revealed Theology	189
§ 28: The Genus of Theology	190
§ 29: Theology as Apprehensive and Discursive	194
§ 30: Defense of Discursive Theology	201
§ 31: Consequences of Theology and of Faith?	204
§ 32: The Unique Principia of Theology	206
§ 33: Modes of Revelation	230
§ 34: The Object of Revealed Theology: True Religion	240
§ 35: The Subject of Revealed Theology: Fallen Man	242
§ 36: The Ends of Revealed Theology	243
III. Index	245

Prefatory Matter

Who is Bernardinus de Moor? and Why Translate his Work?

Bernardinus de Moor was born on January 29, 1709. He studied at the great Dutch University of Leiden, which had been a center of Reformed scholarship from the time of its founding in 1575. Its faculty had included some prominent Reformed theologians, such as Franciscus Junius (1592-1602),¹ Franciscus Gomarus (1594-1611),² Antonius Walæus (1619-1639),³ Johannes Hoornbeeck (1653-1666),⁴ and Herman Witsius (1698-1708),⁵ among others. De Moor attended at Leiden from 1726-1730, and had the opportunity to study under Johannes Wesselius (1712-1745),⁶ remembered for his *Dissertationibus*

¹ Franciscus Junius (1545-1602) was a French theologian and pastor. He studied theology in Geneva under John Calvin and Theodore Beza. Together with Emmanuel Tremellius, he produced a major Latin translation of the Scriptures. He concluded his career as a Professor of Theology at Leiden, at which time he published his *Theses theologicæ* and *De vera theologia*, which became massively influential in the development of the Dogmatic structure of Reformed Scholasticism.

² Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) was a Dutch theologian. Gomarus is most remembered for his opposition to Arminius and Arminianism, and was a significant participant at the Synod of Dort. His systematic work is entitled *Disputationes theologicæ*.

³ Antonius Walæus (1573-1639) was a Dutch Reformed minister and theologian. He studied at Leiden under Franciscus Junius, Lucas Trelcatius, and Franciscus Gomarus. He was appointed as a professor at Middelburg (1609), and in this capacity he attended the Synod of Dort. In 1619, Walæus became a member of the theological faculty at Leiden. He joined Johannes Polyander, Andre Rivet, and Anthony Thysius in the composition of the *Synopsis purioris theologiæ*.

⁴ Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617-1666) earned the degree of Doctor of Theology under Voetius at Utrecht (1643), where he was also appointed professor. In 1653, he went to teach at Leiden, where he died. He excelled in the fields of philology, Old Testament exegesis, church history, and polemical theology.

⁵ Hermann Witsius (1636-1708) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian of the Voetian school. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1675-1680), Utrecht (1680-1698), and Leiden (1698-1708). Witsius' federal theology was heavily influential in the Netherlands, Germany, and Scotland.

⁶ Johannes Wesselius (1671-1745) was a Dutch Reformed Pastor and Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Rotterdam (1711), and then at Leiden, where he produced his systematic *Dissertationes academicas*.

academicis, and Johannes à Marck¹ (1689-1731). De Moor was especially attached to à Marck, and à Marck, shortly before his death, asked De Moor to continue his work,² which he would indeed do.

After his time at Leiden, De Moor labored in the pastoral ministry at Ingen, Broek in Waterland, Zaandam, and Enkuizen.³ He was appointed as Professor of Theology at Franeker in 1744, but, before he was even able to deliver his inaugural address, he was appointed to succeed his former teacher, Johannes Wesselius, as Professor of Theology at Leiden, upon Wesselius' death (1745); De Moor continued in this position for the rest of his life.

It seems that in his teaching method, De Moor honored the dying wish of his teacher and friend, Johannes à Marck. The substance of De Moor's lectures survives in his massive *Continuous Commentary on Johannes Marckius' Didactico-Elenctic Compendium of Christian Theology* (1761-1778; in seven volumes). As its title indicates, De Moor's lectures were something of a running commentary upon the *Compendium* of à Marck, while also drawing upon and digesting the fruits of two centuries of Reformed theological thought. De Moor's *Commentary* is a masterpiece.

The translation of De Moor's *Commentarius* is certainly a massive undertaking. It raises the question: Why expend the effort?

The great Scottish divine William Cunningham said, "The English language, though it contains many valuable works on particular doctrines and on separate subjects in systematic theology, contains comparatively very few systems; *i.e.* very few works in which all the leading doctrines of Christianity are arranged in systematic order, proved from the word of God, and their connections and relations pointed out. Systems of theology have been chiefly the productions of Continental writers, and are to be found principally in the Latin language, —one fact among many others of a similar kind, which establishes the necessity of students of theology acquiring the capacity of

¹ Johannes Marekuis (1656-1731) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian, serving as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1676-1680), Groningen (1682-1689), and finally at Leiden (1689-1731).

² J. Martin Bac, "Clear and Distinct Freedom: A Compendium of Bernardinus de Moor (1709-1780) in a Cartesian Context," *Reformed Thought on Freedom*, eds. Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 201.

³ Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 177.

reading Latin with perfect ease and readiness. Systematic theology, however, has been always a good deal studied by Scottish Presbyterians; and indeed Bishop Burnet alleges that the Presbyterian ministers of the era of the Restoration had for their principal learning an acquaintance with the systematic writers of the Continent.... Calvin, Turretine, Maestricht, Pictet, Marckius, and Witsius, are the authors who have been most generally studied in Scotland as writers on systematic theology; and there can be no doubt that the study of the writings of these men has tended greatly to promote correct and comprehensive views of the scheme of divine truth.... [T]he English language does not contain a great deal, *comparatively speaking*, that is of much value in the way of systems of theology.”¹

“Correct and comprehensive views of the scheme of divine truth”, and all the means that foster such views (including these massive Continental Systems), are certainly to be coveted with a holy covetousness. Since “the capacity of reading Latin” is relatively rare among Ministers and students, and since this does not seem likely to change any time in the near future, it seems desirable to render these works into English. Calvin, Turretin, and Witsius are available in English, but Mastricht, Marckius, Heidegger, and a great many more remain locked up in the Latin tongue. Since translation seems desirable, and yet a translator has limited time and strength, where would be the most economical and advantageous place to begin?

If there were a System, written relatively late in the period of Reformed Orthodoxy, that surveyed and summarized the preceding Systems, this would be valuable in and of itself, giving some knowledge of the others, and would be a springboard for other translation projects in the future. As it turns out, such a System does indeed exist. “[Bernardinus de Moor] wrote a commentary on à Marck’s dogmatic compendium...which represents the most comprehensive dogmatic text that was ever produced in the Netherlands. In this work of seven volumes (1761-1778), de Moor classified and combined material from the Reformed dogmatics produced by his predecessors at Utrecht and Leiden into a whole.”² “The *Commentary* gives an all-round description of theology.... The *Commentary* has the character of an extensive and

¹ *Theological Lectures* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1878), 39, 40.

² Willem J. van Asselt, *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011), 176.

comprehensive handbook for theology.... [T]he primary task was to lend an overview of the clearest expositions for each theological topic.”¹

May the Lord bless this work again, now in English-speaking lands, so that He might be glorified, and His people edified.

¹ J. Martin Bac, “Clear and Distinct Freedom: A Compendium of Bernardinus de Moor (1709-1780) in a Cartesian Context,” *Reformed Thought on Freedom*, eds. Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 202.

Dedication

To the Most Illustrious and Noble

Men

of the Academy of Batava,

which is at Leiden,¹

the Curators,

Gulielmus Count of Bentink,² Toparch³ in Rhoon⁴ and Pendrecht,⁵ member of the Equestrian Order of Holland,⁶ and holding in the name of the same in the Assembly of the delegates of Holland the first place among the Orders,⁷ Assessor to the Prefecture of the highways and waters⁸ of Rhenolandia,⁹ etc., etc., etc.,

Cornelius de Witt, Jurisconsult, Senator and Consular Man of the City of Dordrecht,¹⁰ and Assessor of the illustrious archithalassic college by the authority of the same city, which is on the Meuse River,¹¹ etc., etc.,

¹ Leiden University (*Academia Lugduno Batava*, in Latin) is the oldest university in the Netherlands, founded by William of Orange in 1575.

² William Bentinck (1704-1774) was the first Count Bentinck of the Holy Roman Empire. The Bentincks are a prominent family of Dutch Nobility. Their family estate, Schoonheten House, is in Overijssel, in the central-eastern part of the Netherlands.

³ A *toparchy* is a civil administrative district.

⁴ Rhoon is a village just south of the city of Rotterdam in South Holland.

⁵ Pendrecht is an area located in Rotterdam.

⁶ Each province had its *Equestrian Order*, or *Ridderschap*, composed of representatives of the families of the old feudal nobility. This body exercised executive and legislative powers in its province.

⁷ The State of Holland met four times per year. One delegate was sent to represent the College of the Nobility, and one delegate per city was allowed to each of the eighteen principal cities.

⁸ The *prefects of the highways and waters* were government officials, charged with the administration of the common lands.

⁹ Rhenolandia (*Rijnland*, or *Rhineland*) was an area surrounding Oude Rijn, a minor branch of the Rhine flowing through South Holland.

¹⁰ Cornelius Johansz de Witt (1696-1769) was Burgemeester of Dordrecht, and member of the States of Holland. Dordrecht (or, *Dort*) is a city in South Holland, famous in the annals of Church History for the Synod convened there in 1618-19 to address the Arminian controversy.

¹¹ The Meuse River has its source in France. It flows through Belgium and the Netherlands before emptying into the North Sea. The *Stadhuis*, located on the Meuse, was Dordrecht's City Hall and seat of government.

Petrus Steyn,¹ Jurisconsult, Counselor and Supreme Syndic of the Orders of Holland,² Keeper of the Great Seal,³ Protector of the Supreme Feudal Court and Administrator of its Registry, a Septemvir for the care of the highways, roads, and waters of the Rhine-tract, etc., etc.

And to their colleagues,
the most Honorable and Grave
 Men,
 the Consuls
 of the city of Lugduno-Batava,
 Nicolaus van de Velde, Jurisconsult,
 Johannes van der Marck, Ægid. Fil., Jurisconsult,
 Quæstor of the Sacred Treasury,
 Peter Cunæus, Jurisconsult,
 Henricus van Buren, Jurisconsult,
 all rightly celebrated
 for various offices in the republic happily administrated.

And also
to that most Renowned and Prudent
 Man,
 Johannes van Royen, Jurisconsult,
 Syndic of the city of Leiden, and also to the illustrious
 College of Curators and Consuls
 in charge of the acts.

To all these is dedicated
 this first part of the *Commentary*⁴

¹ Pieter Steyn (1706-1772) studied law at Leiden from 1724 to 1726. He was appointed by the States of Holland as the Grand Pensionary (1749-1772), which was the most important government office during the time of the United Provinces. The Grand Pensionary was the political leader of the whole of the Dutch Republic (when there was no stadtholder); he served as the chairman of the States of Holland, and was recognized by foreign powers as the rough equivalent of a Prime Minister.

² *Syndic* (in general terms, an *advocate* or *representative*) was a title given to the Grand Pensionary.

³ The Great Seal of Holland was committed to the Grand Pensionary.

⁴ *Bernhardini de Moor Commentarius perpetuus in Johannis Marckii compendium theologiæ christianæ didactico-elenticum.*

upon the *Compendium of Theology*
of Johannes Marckius,
formerly a most brilliant star, illuminating by his light
the Academy of Franeker, of Groningen,
and of Lugduno-Batava,
that the author might testify to his own attentiveness,
and commend himself to their benevolence,
with a prayer for every kind
of long-lasting felicity,

D.D.D.¹

Bernardinus de Moor

¹ That is, *Deo Donum Dedit*, or, *given and dedicated to God*.

Preface to the Benevolent Reader

Greetings.

When in the *latter part* of Psalm 22 the Messiah joyfully gives a presentiment of the saving and super-abounding fruit, that, by His Sponsorial Merits and vicarious Passion, the people, given to Him by the Father to be redeemed to Himself, were going to carry off, which people were to be satisfied with the delights of the house of the Lord unto eternal life;¹ the Messiah signifies that in the enjoyment of these spiritual benefits, to be communicated to a world brought unto a glory merited by Himself through sufferings, absolutely every distinction of peoples and nations is going to be removed; such that whatever families of the nations and those that were inhabiting the very ends of the earth were to be led to the gracious communion of God in Christ through the Spirit of faith and repentance, no less than those that were able to be named of Israel by right of birth;² indeed, with the rejection of the latter having been appointed until an especially ἱκανὸν/*suitable* time, the former are to be reputed as the Israel of God, verses 23-28. But also, among all these nations, whichever ones might be in view, without distinction of condition, whether more sumptuous or slight, in the world, it is prophesied that they are to be made partakers of this grace, to be bequeathed in superlative abundance, verse 29: Indeed, this is not going to be the prerogative of one age or of a brief time, but through all ages succeeding one another unto the consummation of this world the seed of the Church is going to be roused, which is going to enlist under God and Christ as King, and rejoice in the privileges of the holy city, verse 30. Now, serving the lavish grant of this blessed, elect people, in the form of means, is what is foretold in the *final verse*, יָבֹאוּ וַיְגִידוּ צְדִיקָתוֹ לְעַם נִזְלָד בֵּי, עַשְׂתֵּה; *they shall come, and shall declare His righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that He hath done this*; with God granting that such would never be wanting to the Church, who might serve the edification of the same, and serve the promotion and consummation of its spiritual joy; but they would willingly come continually, who might persuasively

¹ See Psalm 36:8; 65:4.

² See Psalm 87.

invite each individual unto the saving communion of God and Christ through the preaching of faith and repentance, and might most clearly and publicly declare unto this end the Righteousness of the Lord, and all the divine Virtues at work, manifested especially in the brilliant manner of Redemption. O an especially excellent honor to miserable little men, of whose labor, with God intervening, He is pleased to make use in so great a work! in which it is certainly fitting that they carry themselves as worthy of so excellent a labor, throughout all the industry employed in the business entrusted to them. Now, the Lord stood firm to these His promises, and there have not been wanting at any time, from the first infancy of the Christian Church unto this day, those that have diligently kept watch over the establishment and extension of the same by the preaching of the heavenly Doctrine, both by mouth and by writing.¹

Unto this honor it has also fallen to me to be called as one undeserving, καὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, *and the least of all the saints*,² to whom has been entrusted the assertion and vindication of sound Doctrine and Evangelical Truth under the twofold title both of Pastor of the Church and of Doctor in an Academic School. Which office, committed to me as by a living voice from the dais and throne, I make it a practice to pursue with all my might; thus I believe that there is to be no resistance at all to the peculiar impulse of delivering the same form of sound words also in writing; but that this is to be referred to the divine vocation also, by which divine Providence is wont frequently to stir internally men of our office, to fulfill parts of the imposed function in this manner also. Apart from this, that Witnesses of the Truth have existed in every age, and that the Church has always subsisted in the world by an embracing of the faith delivered to the saints,³ we could not be very certain: by which contrary experience now, we urge in our preaching unto the celebration of the praise of the divine fidelity. Treading in the footsteps of the best Men instead of the poverty of my own talent, I have given, besides some other things, a delineation of Practical Theology in the vernacular language four years and more ago, following especially ὑποτύπωσιν, *the pattern*, left to us by Saint Peter in his second Epistle.⁴ My spirit now compels me to impart to each one a

¹ See also Ephesians 4:11-13.

² Ephesians 3:8.

³ See Jude 3.

⁴ *Het kort begrip en de zekere vastigheid der apostolische leere; van Petrus voorgesteld in het eerste hoofdstuk van zijnen Tweeden Algemeinen Zendbrief.*

richer testament through a description of Dogmatico-Elenctic Theology, how religiously we also on our part in the Academy of Batava in our age cleave to the Holy Doctrine formerly revealed to the Prophets and Apostles, and how, as we have received from our Predecessors of pious memory, so to deliver it undefiled again to the following age is to us the highest of obligations.

So that I might achieve this end, I have undertaken an exposition of the *Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ* of JOHANNES MARCKIUS, certainly in human terms a most complete Theologian, and far below whose merits, commemorated by the eloquent tongue of the illustrious WESSELIUS in his *Oratione Funebris*, my meager preaching must always sink. I took up this Compendium of Theology, in preference to others, for laborious study, for various reasons. Both so that I might show a grateful spirit for the solid education that I was permitted to draw from the mouth and writings of such a Teacher; and for the singular benevolence with which he embraced me while he lived. And so that I might in some measure act answerably to the obligation, concerning which, in the few months before his death, that Man most dear to me, when I, about to perform the final year of my Academic apprenticeship in the gymnasium of Utrecht, was departing hence, said his last farewell to me; indicating that he was hoping that the labor undertaken by me might proceed, where he himself left off: only it was given to me to follow so great a Man at a distance; and to walk with him with equal steps would require a far greater abundance of acute intellect, vast erudition, disciplined judgment, memory most tenacious, and facility most prompt and incredible, than it has befallen either me or most to obtain through the benign Providence of God. Therefore, it was additionally pleasing to me to expound this Compendium of Theology, for, while he surpasses many other Erudite men in his other writings, in abridging this System this most illustrious Man would appear to have surpassed even himself: so that, according to fit and impartial arbiters and judges of these things, it most properly stands out before most other Compendia of Theology, both in its elegant order, apt brevity of words, and immense abundance of altogether solid matter. But this very thing renders a more distinct explication of this Compendium to the Youth of the Academy so much the more necessary and desirable. For verily our Author wrote in the "Preface" set before this work: *A contracted style has been employed by me, not so that I might studiously conceal truths, or because I*

would not be able to express my thoughts more clearly in a massive volume...; but so that according to the method of a Compendium I might embrace many things in a few words, and stir up the judgment and industry of my hearers, etc. Behold, most excellent Young Men, ...this is such a Compendium, that it requires indefatigable labor from you; without which ye shall not make progress by a light reading of it.... The reading ought to follow closely, with attention to the individual words, out of which ye shall not easily discover many set down to little purpose; and the reading rather repeated than excessively hurried or prolonged. Into a part of this labor, with the studious Youth committed to my care, I have desired to enter; and what things everywhere in this Compendium, whether by the brevity of the words, of which hardly a single one slips past without diminishment, or by the dense weight of infinite matters, either are or at first glance appear more obscure, I have tried to illustrate in this writing for easier understanding.

You might say that thus I cut down my own vineyards, since it appears that now nothing remains to Systematic, oral instruction, to be delivered yearly to the Youth of the Academy. But apart from the fact that only the far smallest part of those things, which I have undertaken or will undertake to have transcribed by the press, would I be able to set forth by mouth to my students in the yearly curriculum; I am not able to keep it intact, so as to prevent those, who in the course of instruction desire to compile certain notes into a record, from easily committing more errors, errors easily corrected in this manner. Furthermore, by mouth I teach my students alone, but by writing also those that either in other places are at pains in the unfolding of this System of topics, or shall hereafter advance the same labor also. It had appeared to me hardly advisable after the deliverance of my utterance to commit to others those things that, in this arrangement, I had smeared over paper: but, since we are of a brief age, and that very uncertain, I was unwilling to delay any longer from delivering my commentaries to the press to be printed: out of which, if no other use might redound, at least it might be able to be plain that I have not spent this passing period altogether idly; and the attempt to help the zeal of hearts for God and of those dedicated to the Ministry of the Church perhaps shall not be deprived of all praise.

I was unwilling to place the text of Marckius' Compendium before my Commentary, both because thus the work would grow excessively into a great mass; of its own accord it is still sufficiently ample: and because I suppose it to be far more advantageous, and therefore also more agreeable, to the Reader, if he would place the

entire Compendium of the Illustrious Author next to this Commentary, and then with one glance of the eye be able to read over the entire sentence that I explain, with the things preceding and following, even indeed the whole paragraph here and there; than if for the most part he find one or a few lines, indeed often no line, at the head of a section; hence it would be required to unfold more leaves of the book, before he would discern and understand the genuine sense of the AUTHOR.

For the same reasons that moved our AUTHOR to omit subjoining Practical Uses derived from the individual Heads of Doctrine, I also have refrained from adding the same to this Commentary: to which it is added that whoever is eager to see the summary of Christian Doctrine here related solidly applied to Praxis, he may find his desire satisfied in the works of others, of which ESSENIUS¹ and VAN MASTRICHT² I commend before the others: but, that after the age of these and others like them the Praxis of Theology was brought unto a greater height of perfection, I have not yet been persuaded. Following the thread of the AUTHOR, Christian Doctrine itself, whether Theoretical or more Practical, I have studied to treat with such solidity that I might endeavor at the same time to furnish a guide especially for the Academic Youth to the use of the rest of the writings of the Illustrious MARCKIUS, in which he very frequently explains quite copiously those things which he touched upon with a word in this Compendium, and as a *Supplement* of which writings this Commentary could be considered; and to the use of many other Authors whether of the more ancient or more recent age, either whose footsteps MARCKIUS followed, or unto whom he is to be thought to have alluded, or even a fresh acquaintance with whom for the sake of the truth, whether defended or attacked, also appeared to me not at all useless, indeed even necessary. In the oft repeated praise of the *Fathers*

¹ Andreas Essenius (1618-1677) was educated at the University of Utrecht under the tutelage of Bernardus Schotanus and Gisbertus Voetius. He first served as a minister, and then as a professor of theology at Utrecht (1653). Among his students were Wilhelmus à Brakel and Philipp van Limborch. Essenius wrote both *Systema Theologicæ Dogmaticæ* (1659) and *Compendium Theologiæ Dogmaticæ* (1669), as well as multiple works on the Ten Commandments.

² Petrus van Mastricht (1631-1706) studied at Duisberg, Utrecht, Leiden, Heidelberg, and Oxford. He labored both as a pastor and a professor, eventually succeeding Voetius at Utrecht. His *Theoretico-practica theologia* includes a practical treatment of each doctrinal topic.

of the Church, who were wont to go solemnly by this name, and in the somewhat fuller exposition of those things that the AUTHOR superficially and in haste surveyed out of the Ecclesiastical History and old Heresiology, I have labored to stir the appetite of the studious Youth for the diligent and painstaking cultivation of the study of Patristics and what is involved in searching out the varied condition of the Church, both by rehearsal debate performed in the academic stadium, and by a freer excursion into these expanses throughout all the rest of life; inasmuch as this has been treated more neglectfully by many, nevertheless it is hardly able to be said just how much it would not only be acceptable and agreeable to its cultivators, but how it would grow apt to furnish fruits, additionally solid and most abundant to those in handling Dogmatico-Elenctic Theology, but also in the undertaking of the sacred Ministry, fruits abundantly commended by others, and which the plan of the work does not bear to review here. Now, here and there, in matters regarding the History of the Church, I am wont to appeal and send to the greater Historical Work of SPANHEIM,¹ besides other labors of this most excellent Man, in which he illustrated Sacred History and Antiquities from the stock of his recondite erudition; for, as in the rest of the disciplines, so also in the History of the Church, it is very advantageous to make for oneself one System more familiar before the others: now, I know no fuller and better Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, and which has been produced with greater candor, holy love of the truth, and the polish of judgment, not to mention elegance of pen, than that of Spanheim. Indeed, with so much more willingness am I wont to praise Spanheim in many places, since I am going to pronounce my students especially blessed, if according to the measure of gifts granted to them by the Lord they propose to themselves for imitation that pair of Gravest Theologians, in which our Academy deservedly boasts, MARCKIUS, I say, and SPANHEIM, the teacher of Marckius, whom this Disciple and successor in the Profession of Ecclesiastical History, worthy of such a Teacher, in *Oratione de Christianismi propagati Admirandis*, calls a Man set above all praise, and altogether worthy of immortality before others, whose varied and solid erudition

¹ Frederic Spanheim (1632-1701) studied at Leiden and took the doctoral degree in 1651. He was Professor of Divinity at Heidelberg (1655), and later at Leiden (1670), where he replaced Johannes Cocceius, but was a committed Voetian. He excelled in Historical Theology; the work here referred to is his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

even late posterity will admire: VRIESIUS¹ no less truly sang this of the same Theologian,

*The SPANHEMIAN hand alone is able to
demonstrate by deeds,
not that of another with words, the merit of SPANHEIM.*

Indeed, of the Brethren devoted to the Augusburg Confession,² the Illustrious Buddeus,³ making mention of SPANHEIM'S *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, adds: *Indeed, nothing is able to be said so illustriously concerning this Author, as far as this branch of studies is concerned, which he would not surpass in many ways.* And elsewhere again: *This most erudite Man with great vigor comprehended many things, being most learned in every sort of subsidiary for the perfection of a work of this sort; and he has drawn all things from authentic sources, so much so that, if thou depart from certain hypotheses, in which he serves the interests of his Church, in this regard you would appear to all to achieve a doubtful victory.*

To divide my work into parts, and to publish the same individually, seemed good to me for different reasons, and especially so that I might begin to satisfy more speedily so great a desire of my students, and meet their needs. In the meantime, the entire Commentary has already been prepared for the press, and, if I observe that this first part of the same is received benevolently by the Reader, I will by no means cease enthusiastically to urge the press in promoting the rest of the work. Some Academic Disputations, previously committed to writing and aired publicly by me, which make for a further declaration of this or that systematic truth, I will add to that part of the Commentary, to which they most nearly have regard; as also one and another Oration delivered by me as the business of my office I will add to the final volume. As, indeed, day teaches day,⁴ so also, with the

¹ Gerardus de Vries (1648-1705) was a Voetian philosopher and theologian, and he served as professor of Philosophy (1674-1705) and of Theology (1685-1705) at Utrecht.

² The Augsburg Confession, originally drafted and adopted at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, is the primary confession of the Lutheran Church.

³ Johann Franz Buddeus (1667-1729) was a German Lutheran philosopher and theologian. He served the church as a professor, of philosophy, first at Wittenberg (1687), than at Jena (1689); of Greek and Latin at Coburg (1692); of moral philosophy at Halle (1693); of theology at Jena (1705). He was considered among the most learned and able theologians of his era.

⁴ Psalm 19:2.

wheel of the press rushing to thrust forth this volume, some things have occurred to me during the reading, which I have judged useful to know, to be exhibited at the end of the tome by means of *Addenda*,¹ which I wish to be consulted equally with the very argument of the Commentary. Also, in the use of a transcript of this work made by types I have learned that almost among ἀδύνατα, *things impossible*, is to be placed an edition of any book of greater mass altogether free of all typographical errors: while, although I myself have presided over the correction, and in the doing of it have applied all ἀκρίβειαν, *minute care*, nevertheless some have crept in, although generally of little moment, since in these either the similarity of the letters or the same pressed less clearly often beguiled the keenness of the eye: nevertheless, lest perhaps the less skillful should get stuck in these things, I wished to subjoin a small index of the same to the individual volumes. Indeed, I have already prepared indices for this part of the work, but which I believe to be better to subjoin for the whole work at the end of the last volume, lest one should deem it necessary to consult four, or perhaps even five, Indices, instead of one. So that one might also be able so much the more expeditiously to consult the places in the Ecclesiastical *Fathers*, unto which I sometimes appeal, behold, a syllabus of editions of these Holy Men, whose writings have frequently appeared, of which I am wont to make use, and to cite everywhere:

Magna Bibliotheca Patrum. Paris: 1644, seventeen *tomes*.²

Concilia Generalia Binii, four *tomes*, nine *volumes*. Cologne: 1618.³

Patres Apostolici Cotelarii, two *volumes*. Antwerp: 1698.⁴

¹ In this translation, the *Addenda* are spliced into the body of the work in the appropriate places.

² Marguerin de la Bigne (1546-1595) was a French theologian and expert in Patristic literature. In an effort to lend the strength of the Fathers to the Roman Counter-Reformation, he published *Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum* in nine volumes (1575), containing more than two hundred authors. His work went through several editions and enlargements, including the 1644 *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*.

³ Severin Binius (1573-1641) taught ecclesiastical history and discipline at the University of Cologne, and was eventually appointed as Rector Magnificus of the same (1627-1630). Binius' *Concilia generalia et provincialia* provides the acts of the councils, decretal letters, and the lives of the popes, with explanatory notes.

⁴ Jean-Baptiste Cotelier (1629-1686) was a Roman Catholic theologian and patrologist. Although never ordained to the priesthood, he held a variety of

IGNATIUS' *Epistolæ Pearsoni et Smithi*. Oxford: 1709, in 4°. ¹

JUSTIN MARTYR'S *Opera, cum annexis*. Paris: 1615. ²

IRENÆUS' *Contra Hæreses Massueti*. Paris: 1710. ³

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA'S *Opera*. Paris: 1641. ⁴

ORIGEN'S *Opera de la Rue*. Paris: 1733 and following, four volumes. ⁵

ORIGEN'S *libri VIII contra Celsum, etc., Gulielmi Spenceri*. Cambridge: 1677, in quarto. ⁶

HIPPOLYTUS' *Opera Fabricii*. Hamburg: 1716. ⁷

academic posts. His principal work was *Sacrosanctorum Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabæ, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera edita et non edita, vera et supposita græce et latine, cum notis*, otherwise known as *Patres Apostolici*. It was first published at Paris in 1672; a revised edition was published in 1698 at Antwerp.

¹ Ignatius (c. 40-c. 110) was Bishop of Antioch. He was arrested for the faith, and, as he was being transported through Asia Minor to Rome in order to be executed, he wrote seven letters, encouraging the churches. This particular edition of Ignatius' letters includes the annotations of the Anglican Bishop John Pearson (1613-1686), who vigorously defended the authenticity of the Ignatian letters in his *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii* (1672). Thomas Smith (1638-1710), fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and librarian of the Cottonian library, also participated in the editing.

² Justin, also known as the Martyr, was one of the great Greek apologists of the second century.

³ Irenæus was a second century Church Father, born near Smyrna, but serving as Bishop in Lyon. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was in turn a disciple of the Apostle John. *Against Heresies* was originally written in Greek, but preserved only in Latin (albeit lengthy) quotations (in Hippolytus and Epiphanius) and a few Latin manuscripts. The first printed copy was provided by Erasmus in 1526. From that time to the present, the text of *Against Heresies* has been edited and revised many times, including the 1710 edition by the Benedictine monk Renatus Massuet.

⁴ Titus Flavius Clemens Alexandrinus (died c. 215) was the head of the Christian catechetical school in Alexandria, Egypt. He was trained in pagan philosophy before his conversion to Christianity.

⁵ Origen (c. 185-c. 254) succeeded Clement of Alexandria as the head of the catechetical school in Alexandria. He was perhaps the greatest scholar of his age. The standard edition of Origen's *Opera* was produced by two learned Benedictines, Charles de la Rue, and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, in four volumes published between 1733 and 1759.

⁶ William Spencer, fellow of Trinity-college, edited and annotated this edition of Origen's *Against Celsus*, printing it with Origen's *Philocalia*.

⁷ Hippolytus was a third century bishop and martyr, noteworthy for his learning. He was a disciple of Irenæus and teacher of Origen. Johann Albert Fabricius, a German classicist, produced this edition.

ATHANASIUS' *Opera*, two tomes. Cologne: 1686.¹

BASIL the GREAT'S *Opera*, three tomes. Paris: 1638.²

GREGORY Nazianzen's *Opera Billii*, two tomes. Cologne: 1690.³

GREGORY Nyssen's *Opera*, three tomes. Paris: 1638.⁴

CYRIL of Jerusalem's *Opera of Thomas Milles*. Oxford: 1703.⁵

EPIPHANIUS' *Opera*, two tomes. Cologne: 1682.⁶

CHRYSOSTOM'S *Opera Bernardini de Montfaucon*, 13 tomes. Paris: 1718-1738.⁷

DIONYSIUS the Areopagite's *Opera Corderii*, 2 volumes. Antwerp: 1634.⁸

EUSEBIUS' and others' *Historia Ecclesiastica Valesii*, 3 volumes. Mainz: 1672 and following.⁹

¹ Athanasius (c. 298-373) was bishop of Alexandria, and a great defender of Nicean orthodoxy.

² Basil the Great was a fourth century Church Father and stalwart defender of Nicean Trinitarianism.

³ Gregory of Nazianzus (330-389) was Archbishop of Constantinople, and a doctor of the Church, known as the *Trinitarian Theologian*. Jacques de Billy (1535-1581) was a French patrologist and Benedictine abbot. His first edition of Gregory's *Opera* appeared in 1569.

⁴ Gregory Nyssen (c. 332-396) was Bishop of Nyssa, and a divine of profound learning and great piety. He was a fierce opponent of Arianism, and he took an active part in drafting Constantinopolitan enlargement of the Nicene Creed.

⁵ Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) was elected Bishop of Jerusalem in 350. Cyril was a significant early theologian, and he is remembered for his *Catechetical Lectures*. Thomas Milles (1671-1740) was a bishop of the Church of Ireland.

⁶ The profound erudition of Epiphanius (c. 310-403) led to his installation as Bishop of Salamis. He was something of a heresy hunter, combating Apollinarianism, Origen, and even at one point Chrysostom.

⁷ John Chrysostom (c. 347-407) was Bishop of Constantinople, and the most eloquent preacher of his age. Bernard de Montfaucon (1655-1741) was a French Benedictine monk and patrologist; his edition of Chrysostom's *Opera* in Greek and Latin is the most complete.

⁸ Dionysos was an early sixth century Christian philosopher (showing some Neoplatonic influences) and mystical theologian. This Dionysos was confused with the biblical Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts 17:34) and with Saint Denis of Paris (martyred c. 250). Balthasar Cordier (1592-1650) was a Belgian Jesuit and patrologist. His edition of Dionysos remains the standard.

⁹ Eusebius (c. 267-338) was Bishop of Cæsarea, author of that famous *Ecclesiastical History*, and supporter of Constantine the Great. Henri Valois (1603-1676) was a philologist and expert in the classical and ecclesiastical historians. In 1659, he published an annotated edition of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, followed later by editions of Socrates' and Sozomen's histories, and finally completed with his work on Theodoret, Evagrius, Philostorgius, and Theodore the Lector (1673).

EUSEBIUS' *Præparatio et Demonstratio Euangelica*. Cologne: 1688, 2 volumes.

AMPHILOCHIUS' and others' *Opera Combefisii*. Paris: 1644.¹

CYRIL of Alexandria's *Opera Auberti*, six tomes, seven volumes. Paris: 1638.²

THEODORET'S *Opera Sirmondi*, four tomes: Paris: 1644; 5 tomes *Garinerii*: Paris: 1684.³

PHOTIUS' *Bibliotheca*. Rouen: 1653.⁴

PHOTIUS' *Epistolæ*. London: 1651.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS' *Opera*. Basle: 1575.⁵

ŒCUMENIUS and ARETHAS in *Novum Testamentum*. Verona: 1532.⁶

¹ Amphilochius (c. 340-c. 400) was bishop of Iconium, and worked closely with the famous Cappadocian Fathers in the defense of orthodox Trinitarianism and Christology. François Combefis (1605-1679) was a French Dominican and patrologist. In 1644, he published an edition of the *Works* of Amphilochius of Iconium, Methodius of Olympus (died c. 311; bishop, opponent of Origen, and martyr), and Andrew of Crete (c. 650-c. 720; bishop, theologian, hymnographer, and opponent of Monothelitism).

² Cyril of Alexandria (c. 378-444) was a participant in the third ecumenical council, held at Ephesus. He repudiated the heretical Nestorian Christology but tended himself to the monophysitism. Jean Aubert was Canon Priest at the Church of Laon, and Master of Collège de Laon. Although he was a pioneer in the field of textual criticism, he published little, and little is known of his life.

³ Theodoret (393-457) was bishop of Cyrus, and a significant participant in the Christological controversies of his age. He was an advocate of Antiochian dyophysitism, or moderate Nestorianism, although he condemned the Nestorian affirmation of two Sons in Christ, and the Nestorian denial that Mary was *Theotokos*, that is, *the Mother of God*. His orthodoxy was cleared at the Council of Chalcedon (451). Jacques Sirmond (1559-1651) was a French Jesuit scholar; his edition of the works of Theodoret was supplemented by a fifth volume of materials by Jean Garnier (1612-1681), another French Jesuit patrologist.

⁴ Photius (c. 820-893) was a Patriarch of Constantinople. He is most remembered for his controversies with Rome. His *Bibliotheca* preserves extracts from two hundred and eighty works of classical antiquity, a great many of which are otherwise lost.

⁵ John Damascenus (c. 676-c. 760) was a monk of St. Sabas, near Jerusalem. He is remembered for his piety of life, writings, and compilation of chants in the eastern style; and, due to his defense of icons and his summary of the faith of the Fathers (*Fountain of Knowledge*), he is regarded by many as the last of the Eastern Fathers.

⁶ *Œcumenius* was thought to have been a late-tenth century bishop of Trikkala in Thessaly, but the authorship of the commentaries traditionally ascribed to

TERTULLIAN'S *Opera Rigaltii*. Paris: 1664.¹

CYPRIAN'S *Opera Felli*. Amsterdam: 1700.²

MINUCIUS FELIX *Ouzelii*. Leiden: 1652, in 4°.³

ARNOBIUS' *Adversus Gentes Elmenhorstii*. Leiden: 1651, in 4°.⁴

LACTANTIUS' *Opera Thysii*. Leiden: 1652, in 8°.⁵

LACTANTIUS' *de Mortibus Persecutorum Pauli Bauldri*. Utrecht: 1693, in 8°.⁶

him is confused. The commentaries on Acts and the Catholic Epistles are the same as those of Theophylact of Bulgaria (eleventh century); the commentary on the Pauline Epistles is older, copied in part from the work of Andrew of Cæsarea (563-637); the commentary on the Apocalypse appears to have been composed around the turn of the seventh century. *Arethas* of Cæsarea (ninth century) was a Greek Orthodox bishop and scholar. He compiled *scholia* on the Apocalypse, the oldest extant. *Arethas*' comments on the Apocalypse were appended to the work of Æcumenius in this 1532 edition.

¹ Tertullian was a Latin Father of the second century. He labored as an apologist during times of persecution, and was important in the development of the Trinitarian vocabulary in the Latin-speaking West. Nicolas Rigault (1577-1654) was a French classical scholar. He produced an annotated edition of Tertullian, as well as of Minucius Felix and Cyprian.

² Cyprian (d. 258) served as Bishop of Carthage. He is noted for his strict standard of readmittance into the Church for those who had "lapsed" under persecution. This edition of Cyprian's *Works* was produced by John Fell (1625-1686), bishop of Oxford.

³ Marcus Minucius Felix (third century) was perhaps the earliest Latin apologist. His *Octavius* presents an apologetic encounter between Cæcilius Natalis, a pagan, and Octavius Januarius, a Christian. Jacobus Ouzelius (1631-1686) was a student of classical literature, and produced this heavily annotated edition of Minucius Felix at the age of twenty-one, preserving the comments of the scholars that preceded him.

⁴ Arnobius of Sicca (died c. 330), formerly an opponent of Christianity, was one of the great Christian apologists of his age. Geverhart Elmenhorst (c. 1580-1621) was a native of Hamburg, and a skilled critic. He published his annotated edition of *Adversus Gentes* in 1610, and the 1651 edition contains not only his notes, but those of others as well.

⁵ Lucius Cælius Firmianus Lactantius (c. 240-c. 320) was a trained rhetorician, who, upon his conversion to Christianity, employed his rhetorical gifts in the defense and explication of the Christian faith. His *Divinae Institutiones* is one of the early attempts at a systematic theology. This edition of Lactantius' *Opera* was produced by Antonius Thysius (1565-1640), a Dutch Reformed theologian, professor at the University of Harderwijk and University of Leiden. He was also one of the authors of the 1625 *Synopsis purioris theologiæ*.

⁶ Paul Bauldri (1639-1706), learned professor of Church history at Utrecht, produced this annotated edition of *de Mortibus Persecutorum*.

HILARY'S *Opera studio Benedictinorum*. Paris: 1693.¹

PRUDENTIUS' *Opera Weitzii*. Hannover: 1613, in 8°.²

PHILASTRIUS' *de Hæresibus Fabricii*. Hamburg: 1721, in 8°.³

OPTATUS of Milevis' *de Schismate Donatistarum*, Louis Ellies du Pin.
Antwerp: 1702.⁴

AMBROSE'S *Opera*, five tomes, 2 volumes. Paris: 1642.⁵

JEROME'S *Opera Erasmi*, nine tomes, 4 volumes. Basil: 1537.⁶

AUGUSTINE'S *Opera studio Benedictinorum*, twelve tomes. Antwerp:
1700-1703.⁷

GREGORY THE GREAT'S *Opera*, six tomes, 2 volumes. Paris: 1619.⁸

BERNARD'S *Opera*. Antwerp: 1609.⁹

¹ Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers (d. 368), was, among the Latin Fathers, one of the chief defenders of the Nicean theology against Arianism. This edition of Hilary's *Opera* was corrected and annotated by the Benedictine Monks of the Maurist Congregation, and is still widely regarded for its quality.

² Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (348-407) was a Spanish Christian poet. This edition of his *Opera* was produced by Johann Weitz (1576-1642).

³ Philastrius (died c. 397) was Bishop of Brescia. He participated in the anti-Arian synod of Aquileia held in 381, and wrote *Diversarum Hereseon Librum*. Johann Albert Fabricius (1668-1736), a German classical scholar, produced this annotated edition.

⁴ Optatus was a fourth century bishop of Milevis, in Numidia. He was active against the schism of the Donatists. Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719), a French ecclesiastical historian, produced this edition of *de Schismate* by a careful comparison of ancient manuscripts.

⁵ Ambrose (340-397), Bishop of Milan, was a man of great influence, ecclesiastically and politically, and was instrumental in the conversion of Augustine.

⁶ This edition of Jerome's *Opera* was produced by Desiderius Erasmus (1467-1536), a Dutch humanist, classical scholar, and Roman Catholic theologian. Although he never left the Roman Church, he sought the reformation of its corruptions, and he contributed greatly to the Reformation through the production of his various editions of the Greek New Testament and his *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*. He was certainly one of the greatest and most influential scholars of his time.

⁷ This edition of Augustine's *Opera* was corrected and annotated by the Benedictine Monks of the Maurist Congregation, and was the last critical edition of Augustine's complete works.

⁸ Gregory the Great (c. 550-604) was elected Pope in 590. He was a monk, scholar, prolific author, and, having been made pope, instrumental in reinvigorating the missionary work of the Church.

⁹ Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1157) was a Cistercian monk and abbot, whose learning and austere piety made him very influential in his day.

Furthermore, although in this work I have not wished to offend or provoke to jealousy anyone, at the same time I am wont to speak frankly my opinion, often testifying agreement and remembering them with praise in one place, from whom elsewhere I by no means conceal that I dissent; sometimes even, although quite rarely, from the Most Celebrated AUTHOR, without violation of my respect, which I owe and shall ever have for him. Indeed, attached to no parties, I desire to satisfy the truth alone, and to be serviceable in the declaration, confirmation, and modest defense of the same, by the leading of the Spirit of Truth; so that in this manner the Name of the God of Truth, through the propagation of the Kingdom of Truth, might be glorified more and more, whose glory I am certainly eager always to set before myself as the chief End of all labors, and to whom alone I commit all the success of this work in fervent prayers. Reader, Farewell, and make use of my labor for thine edification in the Lord, if it please Him. Given at Lugduno-Batava on the fifth of August, 1761.

A Survey of the Entire Work

A TREATMENT OF REVEALED CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY HERE FOLLOWS:

- I. *A Nominal treatment*, Chapter I, § 1-6,
- II. *A Real treatment*, in which you may see *True Theology's*
 - A. *Diverse distribution*, Chapter I, § 7-26,
 - B. *Definition as Revealed Theology*, Chapter I, § 27, which Definition is explained,
 - ⌘. With respect to *Genus*, as it is called *Doctrine*, Chapter I, § 28-31.
 - ⌚. With respect to the *Difference of species*, sought
 - α. from its *Principium*, which is the *Word of God revealed in the Sacred Scripture*, concerning which Chapter I, § 32, 33; Chapter II;
 - β. from its *Object*, which is *True Religion*, Chapter I, § 34, concerning which
 - a. It is discussed *more generally*, Chapter III;
 - b. Its argument is explained *more particularly*, inasmuch as it relates
 - a. *The Knowledge of GOD*
 - 1. *Nominal*, Chapter IV, § 1-9,
 - 2. *Real*,
 - §. With respect to the *Essence and Essential Attributes* common to the three Persons of the Deity, Chapter IV, § 10-48,
 - §§. With respect to the *Mystery of the Trinity*, Chapter V,
 - §§§. With respect to the *Divine Works*, and those
 - / . either *Internal*, which are the *Decrees of God*: concerning which
 - . It is discussed generally, Chapter VI,
 - . The Decree of *Predestination* is considered specifically, Chapter VII,
 - // . or *External*, which are
 - . either of *Nature*, of which sort two especially,
 - †. *Creation*, which
 - AA. Is explained more generally, Chapter VIII,

BB. Is discussed specifically concerning the most excellent of Creatures, namely, the *Angels*, Chapter IX,

††. *Providence*, concerning which Chapter X,

— or of *Grace*, which works shall be explained, in which shall be treated the *Subject* to be instructed in Theology, namely, *Man*, considered in his fourfold State;

b. *The Worship* of GOD, of which worship thus

1. The *Nature* is explained, Chapter XI, § 1-6, so that
2. The *Norm* of this worship might be especially explained, §. Namely, the many-faceted *Law* of God, as it is to be seen, Chapter XI, § 7-21, §§. Especially the *Moral Law*, concerning which it is discussed in more detail, to the end that
 - / . The *Preamble*, *Propriety*, and *Division* of this Law might be premised more generally, Chapter XI, § 22-40,
 - // . The individual *Precepts of the Decalogue* might be explained one-by-one, Chapter XII:

γ. from its *Subject*, to be furnished with the Knowledge of Theology, which in itself, as an eminent Work of God, and the End and Object of the greatest works of God, is most worthy of consideration, and hence also is wont to be called the *Secondary Object* of Theology, see Chapter I, § 35: Is delivered

a. Its *Nature* in general, Chapter XIII,

b. Its *Fourfold State* in particular;

- a. As *Instituted*, or of *Integrity*, concerning which Chapter XIV,
- b. As *Destituted*, or of *the Fall*, comprehending under itself
 1. *Sin*, concerning which Chapter XV,
 2. *Punishment*, concerning which Chapter XVI,
- c. As *Restituted*, or of *Grace*, by way of *the Covenant of Grace*; of which
 1. A nominal Treatment and real Definition see Chapter XVII, § 1-4,
 2. An Explication of this Definition follows, §. With respect to *Genus*, of *mutual Compact*, Chapter XVII, § 5, §§. With respect to the *Difference of Species*, according to which this Compact is *differentiated* from others,

- / . By the *Word*, by which it is revealed, namely, the *Gospel*, concerning which it is treated, and concerning the diverse dispensation of this and of the Covenant of Grace itself, Chapter XVII, § 6-19,
- //. By the *Mediator* appointed, concerning whom
 - . It is discussed *more generally*, Chapter XVIII,
 - . Then *more specifically* are delineated this Mediator's
 - † . *Person*, with respect to His *Names*, *Natures*, the *Union* of those, and the *Effects* of this, Chapter XIX,
 - †† . Threefold Mediatorial *Office*, *Prophetic*, *Priestly*, and *Royal*, Chapter XX,
 - ††† . *State of Humiliation* and of *Exaltation*, Chapter XXI,
- ///. By the prescribed *Duties*, of *Faith* and *Repentance*, which are explained, Chapter XXII,
- ////. By the *Benefits* promised, of which
 - . The four primary are distinctly explained,
 - † . *Vocation*, Chapter XXIII,
 - †† . *Justification*, Chapter XXIV,
 - ††† . *Sanctification*, which is considered,
 - AA. In itself, Chapter XXV, § 1-13,
 - BB. In its proper fruit of Holiness and of *Good Works*; concerning which again
 - xx. It is discussed *more generally*, Chapter XXV, § 14-21,
 - bb. It is treated *more specifically*
 - αα. concerning *Prayer*, which is the most excellent Good Work, Chapter XXVI, § 1-21,
 - ββ. concerning some Works closely connected to Prayer, such as *Fasting*, *Keeping Vigil*, *Alms-giving*, *Vows*, Chapter XXVI, § 22-40,
- . The same things, expressed under a different notion, are propounded by the names of

Regeneration, Adoption, Reconciliation, and Redemption or Liberation; under which relation the same Benefits are more briefly explained, Chapter XXVIII,

////. By the *Seals* annexed, namely, the *Sacraments*, which

— . Are *generally* declared, Chapter XXIX, § 1-4,

— . Are *specifically* expounded individually,

†. Both of the *Old Testament*,

AA. The *Extraordinary*, at least cursorily, Chapter XXIX, § 5,

BB. The *Ordinary*, more prolifically,

⌘⌘. *Circumcision*, Chapter XXIX, § 6-17,

⌘⌘. *Passover*, Chapter XXIX, § 18-27,

††. And of the *New Testament*, which

AA. In general are taught to be only *Two*, with whatever *Sacraments Falsely So-Called* hence rejected, Chapter XXIX, § 28-36,

BB. Are declared with great exertion,

⌘⌘. *Baptism*, Chapter XXX,

⌘⌘. *The Lord's Supper*, Chapter XXXI;

/////. By the *Multitude Covenanted*, to which the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace are actually conferred, namely, the *Church*,

— . Concerning which, Chapter XXXII,

— . And concerning its *Government*, both *Special*, *Ecclesiastical*, and *Common* with other men, *Political* and *Domestical*, Chapter XXXIII;

d. As *Constituted*, or *Pre-determined*, or of *Glorification*, which is declared, Chapter XXXIV, in which we especially attain,

δ. The *End of the Glory of God and of the Salvation of the Elect*, which, as the End of the whole of our Theology, the AUTHOR was propounding, Chapter I, § 36.

Chapter I:

Concerning the Word and Definition of Theology

Summary of Chapter I

In this Chapter occurs,

- I. A Nominal Treatment of THEOLOGY, § 1-6, in which things pertaining to the Name are to be considered:
 - A. Its Etymology, inasmuch as it is composed of Θεός/*theos*/God and λόγος/*logos*/word, with the result that it is Θεοῦ λόγος, *theou logos*, a word of, or pertaining to, God, § 1, in the former part; hence is exhibited
 - α. The original signification of the Name Theology, § 1, in part two.
 - β. Is delivered the first, ἄγραφος/*unwritten*, use of the word, even with respect to the paronymic name of Theologian, § 2;
 - γ. Are set forth the component words ἔγγραφοι/*written*, Θεοῦ λόγια, *theou logia*, the oracles of God, and Θεοῦ λόγος, *theou logos*, the word of God, and this indeed
 - α. ἐνυπόστατος, or personal, § 3,
 - β. προφορικὸς, or uttered, § 4, in the former part;
 7. The conclusion is hence deduced, that the term Theology is not to be rejected as ἄγραφον, a thing unwritten, § 4, in the latter part:
 - B. Its Synonymy, § 5,
 - C. Its Homonymy, as it is used of Theology
 - α. False, which is said to be chiefly fourfold,
 - α. Pseudo-Christian,
 - β. Mohammadan,
 - γ. Contemporary Jewish,
 - δ. Gentile, and that again,
 - a. Fabulous,
 - b. Natural,
 - c. Civil:
 - β. True, § 6.
- II. A Real Treatment; in which are to be observed
 - A. The Division of True Theology with respect to the Subjects, according to which in the first place is Archetypal or Ectypal:
 - B. An Explication of this Division; even indeed
 - α. Of Theology Archetypal, § 7;

2. Ectypal, *which*

- α. *Is explained in general*, § 8, in the beginning,
- β. *Is subdivided into the Theology*
 - a. *Of Union, concerning which* § 8, in the latter part,
 - b. *Of Vision, concerning which* § 9,
 - c. *Of the Race-course; of which*
 - a. *The Nature is explained*, § 10,
 - b. *The Existence is proven*, § 11, and *which*
 - c. *Is divided again into Theology Natural and Revealed.*
 - 1. *Concerning Natural Theology the Author treats*, § 12-22:
 - §. *The Existence of it*
 - I. *He asserts, and distinctly indeed*
 - *Of Theology Innate*, § 12,
 - *Of Theology Acquired*, § 13:
 - As if in parentheses the AUTHOR inserts here two Observations:*
 - I. *For the acquisition of Natural Theology Universal Doubt, concerning even the Existence of God Himself, is not to be urged*, § 14;
 - II. *In what sense the Idea of God is to be admitted in man, and in what way the argument for the Existence of God thence fetched is valid and not valid*, § 15;
 - II. *He distinguishes the Natural Theology in man Fallen from the Natural Theology of Adam*, § 16;
 - III. *He vindicates from the Objections of those denying it, especially of the Socinians*, § 17;
 - §§. *The Object of it he delineates, relating just how far*
 - I. *Positively it actually reaches*,
 - II. *Negatively it does not reach*, § 18;
 - §§§. *An Adjunct hence flowing, namely, the Insufficiency of Natural Theology for salvation;*
 - I. *It is constructed with arguments*, § 19;
 - II. *It is freed from the Objections of the Pelagians and Socinians*, § 20:
 - §§§§. *The Agreement and Difference of Natural and Revealed Theology is indicated*, § 21;
 - §§§§§. *The End of Natural Theology is observed*, § 22:
 - 2. *Concerning Revealed Theology the AUTHOR speaks*, §

23-36,

§. *The Necessity of which he demonstrates*, § 23;

§§. *The various Divisions of which he treats, according to which there is*

I. *Practical or Habitual, with a supernatural Character, composed of Knowledge, Wisdom, Prudence*, § 24;

II. *Doctrinal or Systematic, which*

— *Again is divided*

†. *With respect to its Parts, especially into Didactic and Elenctic*, § 25, in the first part,

††. *With respect to the Manner of treatment, into*
AA. *Positive, and*

BB. *Scholastic; which latter again*

αα. *Either is so called in a good sense, which is set forth*, § 25, in the latter part,

ββ. *Or in an inferior sense, for the Scholastic Theology of the Papists, concerning which what is to be insisted on is shown*, § 26;

— *Is defined*, § 27, *which Definition is explained*

†. *With respect to Genus*, § 28-31, *which*

AA. *In general is called Doctrine*, § 28, in the beginning,

BB. *In particular*

αα. *Practical no less, indeed more, than Theoretical; which*

αα. *Is proven,*

ββ. *Is defended against Objections*, § 28, in the second part;

ββ. *Doctrine, not only Noëtic, but also Dianoëtic, in which the use of Consequences*

αα. *Is asserted*, § 29, the first part,

ββ. *Is defended against Anabaptists, Lutherans, and Papists*, § 29, the second part, § 30;

γγ. *The Papistical Division of Consequences into Conclusions Theological and of Faith is rejected*, § 31;

††. *With respect to the Difference of Species, sought*

from

AA. *Its Principium, whence Revealed Theology is drawn; which*

XX. *With respect to its own nature,*

αα. *Is explained,*

aa. *Positively, inasmuch as it is the sole Word of God:*

bb. *Negatively; in which are rejected,*

aa. *The Decrees of Synods,*

bb. *The authority of the Fathers or of the Philosophers,*

cc. *The Testimony of the Senses,*

dd. *Human reason, the manifold Use of which in Revealed Theology is nevertheless indicated,*

‡. *Ministerial, and that various;*

‡‡. *The more Principal, § 32;*

ββ. *Is confirmed, § 33, in the beginning;*

γγ. *With respect to the Mode of Revelation was various, as it is related, § 33, the last part;*

BB. *Its Object, which is true Religion, § 34,*

CC. *Its Subject, which is Fallen Man, § 35,*

DD. *Its End, which is*

XX. *Supreme, the Glory of God,*

γγ. *Subordinate, the Salvation of Men, § 36.*

§ 1: Etymology of “Theology”

Just as in the treatment of any Theological argument in what follows, so, when the AUTHOR in this locus undertakes to delineate this entire discipline, he makes a beginning from the explication of the *Name/Term*; properly mindful of that saying of PLATO in *Cratylus*: Πρὸς τὸ ὀρθῶς διδάσκειν, δεῖ πρῶτον ἐξετάζειν τὰ ὀνόματα, *in order to teach rightly, it is first necessary to examine the names/terms*: in which manner Plato spoke with good reason; while according to *Diodotus*¹ in THUCYDIDES’ *History of the Peloponnesian War*,² book III, Οἱ λόγοι διδάσκαλοι τῶν πραγμάτων γίνονται, *words become the teachers of the matters at hand*. Which opinion JULIUS SCALIGER, among the more recent men, supports in his *De Subtilitate, Exercitation I, section I*,³ “In the first place, it is proper to inquire into the use of the word itself: by which we have on numerous occasions been carried into the perception of the thing.” Now, as far as it concerns the *Etymology* of the word THEOLOGY, our discipline has this in common with diverse others, that it is wont to be distinguished by a *Greek* term: For *Theology* according to our AUTHOR is Θεοῦ λόγος, *Theou logos*, *a word of, or pertaining to, God*, unless you should judge that it is of greater ἀκριβείας/*precision* to say that τὴν θεολογίαν, *theology*, is the Science, which ὁ θεολόγος, *the theologian*,⁴ treats: that he is θεολόγον, *a theologian*, indeed, who is διδασκὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, *taught of God*,⁵ discourses

¹ Nothing is known of Diodotus, son of Eucrates, except what little Thucydides records of him. After the revolt of the Mytilene, he opposed the proposal of Cleon (leader of the imperialist faction in Athens in 427 BC) to kill all the adult Mytilenean men and to enslave the rest. Diodotus’ speech carried the day.

² Thucydides (c. 460-c. 400 BC) was a Greek historian. His *History of the Peloponnesian War* recounts the fifth century BC conflict between Sparta and Athens.

³ Julius Cæsar Scaliger (1484-1558) was an Italian scholar of the first order, and champion of Aristotelianism against the new Renaissance humanism. His *De Subtilitate Exercitationes* demonstrates his mastery of Aristotle’s physics and metaphysics, and continued to be a popular textbook until Aristotelianism finally gave way before the new learning.

⁴ That is, *one who discourses concerning divine things*.

⁵ See John 6:45: “It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of

concerning God, sets forth Θεοῦ λόγον, *a word of God*, λόγον περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *a word concerning God*: which sort of ἀκρίβεια/*precision*, with greater circumlocution returning to the same thing, in other compound names of similar form shall be observed likewise. But in this the denomination of *Theology* differs in a certain measure from other disciplines, that the rest are generally wont to be denominated especially from their *Object*, like Jurisprudence, Pneumatics, Physics; even those which have a name of the same formation as has the name of *Theology* with respect to the word, Astrology, Etymology, Meteorology, Ontology, Osteology: *Theology*, on the other hand, deserves thus to be called, not by reason of its *Object* only, but also by reason of its *Principium*; to which twofold consideration other considerations are also able to be added secondarily, when the reckoning of the Etymology of this name comes to be given. It is evident that the Doctrine and discourse, which is established concerning *Astris*/Stars, concerning Meteors, concerning Being, concerning *Ossibus*/Bones, is not able to be fetched from the word or speech of stars, meteors, being, or bones: but, on the other hand, *the Speech and doctrine concerning God* is also able to be drawn *from the speech of the very God revealing*; so that we are not able to speak concerning God without God, who teaches man, both through the created world, and in an especially and far more sublime and complete manner in the θεοπνεύστῳ/*God-breathed/inspired Word*, concerning Himself and matters regarding Himself. Thus the Most Illustrious VITRINGA,¹ in his *Sacrarum Observationum*, book III, chapter I, § 2, 3, 8, shows, that τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the testimony of Christ*, 1 Corinthians 1:6, is able to be taken in a twofold manner, either of the testimony which Christ Himself spoke, or concerning the testimony which others gave concerning Christ. GLASSIUS,² in his *Grammaticorum Sacrorum tractatu* I, canon 30, page 102 and following, is able to be

God (διδάκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.”

¹ Campegius Vitringa Sr. (1659-1722) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and Hebraist. He was a critical Cocceian, and heavily influenced by his pastor, Herman Witsius. He served the university at Franeker, first as professor of Oriental languages (1681), then of Theology (1682) and Church History (1697). He is remembered as a Hebraist *par excellence*, and for his commentaries on Isaiah and Revelation.

² Solomon Glassius (1593-1656) was a German Lutheran divine and critic. He was Professor of Divinity at the University of Jena. His *Philologia Sacra* was a groundbreaking work in Biblical Hebrew.

compared, and also GEORGIUS PASOR,¹ *Grammatica Græca sacra Novi Testamenti*, page 281: in which, of course, they relate the diverse uses of the Genitive, and teach that the Genitive is quite often of *Object*, inasmuch as λόγος τῆς βασιλείας, *the word of the kingdom*, is *the word concerning the kingdom*, Matthew 13:19; but that elsewhere it is also of the *Efficient*, as when, in Matthew 25:34, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ Πατρὸς, *the blessed of the Father*, of Christ are mentioned, and when John opposes τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *the witness of men*, and τὴν μαρτυρίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the witness of God*, to each other, 1 John 5:9. So also Θεοῦ λόγος, *a word of God*, and *Theology* are no less able to denote *the speech of God*, which has been delivered by God to us, than, θεοδίδακτοι, in 1 Thessalonians 4:9, signifies *those taught by God*, who in John 6:45 are called διδασκατοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *those taught of God*, of which sort is πᾶς—ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν, *every one that hath heard and learned of the Father*; and thus θεοπροπία and θεοπρόπιον in Homer² is *an oracle, a prophecy*. This, which is next to be observed in the first part, comes against Hobbes,³ among others, who contends that *Christian Theology* signifies the Word of God, not that which God has spoken; but that which is concerning God and His kingdom, that is, is delivered in Christian doctrine: see COCQUIUS⁴ *Hobbesianismi Anatomen*, locus I, chapter I. But also note that there is a Genitive of *End*; for example, *the house of God* is called οἶκος προσευχῆς, *a house of prayer*, Matthew 21:13; and in John 5:29 are mentioned ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, *the resurrection of life*, and ἀνάστασις κρίσεως, *the resurrection of judgment*, that is, *the resurrection unto life and unto condemnation*: and in this sense Theology or *the speech of God* is able to be considered, for it tends to the glory of God, and leads to His communion. *Theology*, says Thomas Aquinas,⁵ *is taught by God*,

¹ Georgius Pasor (1570-1637) was a Reformed theologian and learned philologist; he served as Professor of Theology at Herborn (1607-1626) and Professor of Greek at Franeker (1626-1637).

² *Iliad* 1:85, 87; 6:438; *Odyssey* 1:145.

³ Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was an English philosopher, remembered for his work in political philosophy and social contract theory. He was also interested in theology, but heterodox in his beliefs, denying incorporeal substance (reducing all things to matter and motion), and the divine inspiration of the Biblical prophets.

⁴ Gisbertus Cocquius (1630-1708) of Utrecht was a Reformed thinker and doctor of philosophy; he opposed Hobbes.

⁵ Thomas Aquinas (c. 1224-1274) was perhaps the greatest of the mediæval

teaches God, and leads to God.¹ With which things, if you should desire to consult further, you may, as far as I am concerned, consult what things the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS² has in his *Summa Theologiæ*, chapter I, § I, *Opera*, tome 7, page 133. According to him, *Theology* is the knowledge or speech τοῦ θεολόγου, *of the theologian*. Indeed, to him he is called θεολόγος, *a theologian*, ὁ τὸν Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς δόξαν αὐτοῦ λέγων, *who speaks of God, from God, in the presence of God, for His glory*: which he then explains in that very place by parts.

scholastic theologians. His *Summa theologica* and *Summa Contra Gentiles* are still standards in Roman Catholic theology, and have been heavily influential in almost all Christian thought in the West.

¹ A summary of *Summa Theologica* 1:1:7.

² Johannes Cocceius (1603-1689) was born in Bremen, Germany, and went on to become Professor of Philology at the Gymnasium in Bremen (1630), held the chair of Hebrew (1630) and theology (1643) at Francker, and was made Professor of Theology at Leiden (1650). He was the founder of the Cocceian school of covenant theology, bitter rival to the Voetian school.

§ 2: Extra-Biblical Uses of “Theology”

According to our AUTHOR, *the use of the word proceeded from the Gentiles*. Among whom he that is related as the first to have described the origins of things, the religion of the Egyptians and Phœnicians, namely, Sanchuniathon the Phœnician,¹ goes by the name of θεολόγου/*theologian* in EUSEBIUS' *Præparatione Euangelica*, book I, chapter IX, page 31, just as those things that he left behind, written under the title, ἡ φοινίκων θεολογία, *The Theology of the Phœnicians*, are praised by THEODORET, in his *de curandis Græcorum adfectionibus*, sermon II, opera, tome 4, page 501. For the same reason, the most ancient Poets, who wrote θεογονίας/*theogonies*,² are called *Theologians*: AUGUSTINE, in his *de Civitate Dei*, book XVIII, chapter XIV, “During the same interval of time were the *Poets*, who may also be called *Theologians*, since they were composing songs about the gods, but about such gods that were, although great men, yet mere men, etc.” But skill in sacred rites and in divine things was going by the name of θεολογίας/*theology*, and was conferring the title of θεολόγου/*theologian* upon such an one: Orpheus is said to have attained *great glory among the Greeks ἐπὶ μελωδίᾳ καὶ τελεταῖς καὶ θεολογίαις*, *by the singing of songs, by the institution of sacred rites, and by the interpretation of divine things*,³ in DIODORUS SICULUS' *Bibliotheca Historica*, book I, chapter XXIII, page 27. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, in his *Protreptico*, page 16, has: Ἐκτος ἐστὶ τρόπος, καθ' ὃν ἀριθμοῦσι Θεοὺς τοὺς δώδεκα· ὧν καὶ Θεογονίαν Ἡσίοδος ᾄδει τὴν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὅσα θεολογεῖ Ὅμηρος, *it is the sixth way, according to which they number the twelve gods: of which Hesiod⁴ sings in*

¹ Sanchuniathon is a Phœnician author, almost as old as Moses. His works, including material on creation and the history of the gods, survive only in fragments.

² That is, *genealogies of the gods*.

³ Although there is now some doubt about his historical existence, Orpheus was esteemed among the Greeks of the classical ages as the greatest of the poets and musicians. It was said that he was able to charm all living things, indeed, even stones, with his music.

⁴ Hesiod lived around the turn of the seventh century BC. In his poetry (particularly, *Theogony*), he preserves a most ancient form of Greek mythology.

his *Theogony*, and of which Homer theologizes. Indeed, also the Philosophers, who were considered skilled in divine things, were called *Theologians*: as for instance, Pherecydes,¹ the teacher of Pythagoras,² thus obtained the title θεολόγου/*theologian*: see OWEN'S³ *Theologoumena*, book I, chapter I, pages 3, 4; HOORNBECK'S *Theologiam Practicam*, tome I, preface, pages 2, 3; and BUDDEUS' *Theologiam Dogmaticam*, tome I, book I, chapter I, § 37, pages 66, 67.

[For in the works of these, Theology was celebrated from the beginning as multi-layered.] Compare also § 6 of this Chapter.

[The appellation of Theologian, by which thus the Apostle John himself, etc.] As is apparent, those things are uncertain and of dubious credit, which concerning the other John, the *Ephesian Elder*, whom Dionysius Alexandrinus⁴ proposed to be held as the author of the Apocalypse, are mentioned in EUSEBIUS' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book III, chapter XXVIII, and book VII, chapter XXV. On the contrary, of the Fathers the most excellent, and those approaching most nearly to the age of the Apostles, Irenæus,⁵ Justin Martyr,⁶ Origen,⁷ Tertullian,⁸ and Eusebius, acknowledge that the Apostle John is the writer of the Apocalypse; to whom those things which are written in Revelation 1:1, 2, 9, also best agree; and he himself was also able to call himself πρεσβύτερον, *an elder*, in his Epistles,⁹ no less than Peter calls himself

¹ Pherecydes of Syros (flourished in the sixth century BC) was a philosopher. In his *Pentemychos*, he presents a mythological cosmogony, and hence Plutarch, in his *Parallel Lives*, calls him a *theologian*.

² Pythagoras (582-507 BC) was a Greek philosopher and mathematician.

³ John Owen (1616-1683) sided with the Parliament during the Civil War. However, he did not embrace the Presbyterianism of the Westminster Assembly, preferring Independency. He won the esteem of Oliver Cromwell, and Cromwell made him Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (1651) and then Vice-chancellor (1652). He lost the deanery at the Restoration. After the Restoration, Owen would suffer the vicissitudes that accompanied his convictions, but his was the most persuasive and respected voice for Independency and toleration.

⁴ Dionysius of Alexandria (c. 200-265) converted to Christianity at a mature age, and became a student of Origen at the Catechetical School of Alexandria. He became the leader of the school in 231, and the Bishop of Alexandria in 248.

⁵ *Against Heresies*, book V, chapters 30-35.

⁶ *Dialogue with Trypho*, chapter 81.

⁷ *De Principiis*, book II, chapters 10, 11.

⁸ *Against Marcion*, book III, chapter 24.

⁹ 2 John 1; 3 John 1.

συμπρεσβύτερον, *a fellow elder*, 1 Peter 5:1; see the most Illustrious LAMPE¹ in his "Prolegomenis" in *Joannis Evangelio*, book I, chapter VII, § 8, 25, etc. The same John, Apostle and Presbyter, will be distinguished also by the name of *Theologian* in the Inscription of the Apocalypse. That solid reasons were certainly not lacking to CHRISTOPH AUGUST HEUMANN,² on account of which he undertook to contend that John the Theologian was different from John the Apostle, in a certain *Dissertatione*³ inserted in *Actis Lipsiensibus*, supplementum, tome 6, section 4, pages 170, etc; LAMPE shows in the *place just cited*, § 20. Nevertheless, this title in the Inscription of the Apocalypse appears to have originated from the Fathers in the ancient Church, rather than from the Holy Spirit Himself: 1. because neither the Syriac, nor the Vulgate, nor the Arabic Translation has this title: 2. another Inscription in verses 1 and 2 follows in the text itself; whence this external Inscription, which precedes, appears to be of human origin, and also the *Subscriptions of the Epistles*,⁴ in which too much confidence ought not to be placed: 3. Also the words θεολόγου/*theologian* and θεολογίας/*theology* began to be used more frequently in the following age, and to be attributed to John especially after the fourth Century. According to the most Illustrious LAMPE, in the *place cited*, § 19, "It is certain that not one of the Fathers of the first three centuries called John θεολόγον, *the Theologian*, even when they made mention of the Apocalypse.... The first, as far as it can be established, was EUSEBIUS, who in his *Præparatione Euangelica*, book XI, chapter XVIII, called him ἑβραίων θεολόγον, *a theologian of the Hebrews*. Yet OWEN in his *Theologoumenis* I:I, pages 5, and LEYDEKKER⁵ in his

¹ Frederic Adolphus Lampe (1683-1729) studied under Campegius Vitringa, and held various ministerial posts. At Utrecht he was appointed Professor of Theology (1720), then of Church History (1726). He departed to teach at Bremen in 1727, and died there in 1729. He was especially learned in ecclesiastical history and antiquities.

² Christoph August Heumann (1681-1764) was a Lutheran divine, and Professor of Theology at the University of Gottingen.

³ *Dissertatio de titulo Theologi Joanni Prophetæ in inscriptione Apocalypseos tributo.*

⁴ See the subjoined *subscriptions* at the end of the Pauline Epistles in the Authorized Version. For example, Philemon 25: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen. [*Written from Rome to Philemon, by Onesimus a servant.*]"

⁵ Melchior Leydekker (1642-1721) studied under Voetius at Utrecht, and Hoornbeeck and Cocceius at Leiden. He was appointed Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1676).

Veritate Euangelica triumphante, book I, chapter I, § 50, pages 12, 13, say repeatedly that it is certain that *Origen*, who was of the third century, was the first to adorn John with the Title θεολόγου/*Theologian*: but neither stated in writing the place. But they likely have regard to those things which occur in "Homily 2" in *Diversos ad initium Euangelii Johannis, opera ORIGENIS ex editione Frobenii*, 1545,¹ tome 2, page 292, "And so blessed *John the Theologian* soars over, not only those things which are able to be understood and spoken, but also those things which surpass all understanding, and sail above expression, etc." Indeed, diverse Fathers, that called *John the Theologian*, are mentioned by SUICERUS in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus*,² tome I, columns 1359, 1360; to which LAMPE adds more in his "Prolegomenis" on *Joannis Evangelium*, book I, chapter VII, § 19, in the notes.

Now, that John is so called *because of the Divine Sublimity of his doctrine*, judge those who think that the reason for this denomination is to be sought in the book of the Apocalypse itself, to which this title is prefixed. But the opinion is more widely received, which asserts that the title of *Theologian* was bestowed upon John κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *preeminently*, on account of that divine doctrine concerning the Trinity, and especially *concerning the Deity of the Son*, which no one delivered more luminously and overtly than our Evangelist in his writings and especially in his Gospel. Not without reason do the learned men thus decide: for the signification of the solemn language of θεολογίας/*theology* (which ὁ θεολόγος, *the theologian*, best understands and delivers to others) in the writings of the Fathers is, that it denotes either the doctrine of God and the Holy Trinity, or the divine nature of Christ and the doctrine concerning it: in both senses θεολογία/*theology* and οἰκονομία/*economy* are opposed to each other, and by οἰκονομίαν/*economy* is understood the dispensation of the Incarnation, the human nature of Christ, and the doctrine concerning it: EUSEBIUS in his *Demonstratione*

¹ Hieronymus Frobenius (1501- 1565) followed his father, Johann Froben (c. 1460-1527), in the business of printing and publishing. Their printing house had an international reputation for accuracy and quality. Hieronymus printed an edition of the Greek Fathers.

² John Caspar Suicer (1620-1684) was a Swiss theologian and philologist. He studied at Saumur and Montauban, and served as Professor of Hebrew and Greek at the University of Zurich (1660). His *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus* was invaluable in the study of the Greek Fathers, shedding light upon words and expressions untreated by lexicographers.

Euangelica, book III, *proæmio*, Τίνα δὲ ἦν ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ἢ τὰ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομίας Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, αἶτε τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις Προφητῶν περὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν θεολογίας διδασκαλίας, καὶ αἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ προρρήσεις, *these were actually concerned with the human dispensation/economy of Jesus the Christ of God, and the teaching of the Hebrew prophets on the theology based on His Person, and predictions of His appearance among men; see LAMPE in his "Prolegomenis" on Joannis Evangelium, book I, chapter VII, § 21, and SUICERUS on the words θεολογέω, to speak of divine things, and θεολογία/theology, columns 1355-1358, where you may see that by Gregory Nyssen, Eusebius, Basil the Great, and Theophylact,¹ it is ascribed to John that he delivers θεολογίαν/theology especially in his Gospel; while CHRYSOSTOM, or Severianus Bishop of Gabala,² in the sermone de Sigillis, chapter V, in Opera Chrysostomi de Montfaucon, tome 12, page 412, elegantly speaks concerning the remaining Evangelists in contradistinction to John, οἱ μὲν ἄστραψαν τὴν οἰκονομίαν, ὁ δὲ βροντᾷ τὴν θεολογίαν, in the works of the others the lightning of the economy or incarnation, but in his work thunder concerning the Deity of the Son, are found. This also is the reason why Gregory Nazianzen, who vigorously defends the divinity of the Savior against the Arians, began to come into the title of Theologian also; which Gregorius Presbyter, in his life of Gregory,³ teaches to have been for the greatest honor, Operis Nazianzeni, tome I, in the beginning, asserting that Nazianzen was so eminent for sublimity of doctrine καὶ θεολογία, and theology, that, although many men θεολογήσαντες, having spoken of divine things, in various ages, were celebrated with the praise of doctrine, μόνον τοῦτον μετὰ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην θεολόγον ἀναφανῆναι, he alone after John the Evangelist was set forth as the Theologian, καὶ οἶον ἐξαίρετον αὐτῷ, ταύτην ἀποκληρωθῆναι προσηγορίαν, and this surname fell to him as a*

¹ Theophylact was an eleventh century Archbishop of Achria of Bulgaria. He composed commentaries on most of the New Testament and portions of the Old.

² Severian was Bishop of Gabala in Syria. He came to Constantinople *circa* 398, and developed a reputation as a preacher. Although initially a friend of Chrysostom, he turned hostile after being insulted by some of Chrysostom's men, and helped secure his condemnation at the Synod of the Oak. Some of Severian's sermons were preserved in Greek among Chrysostom's own.

³ Gregorius Presbyter, perhaps of Cappadocia, wrote a tenth century biography of Gregory Nazianzen.

peculiar and distinguished privilege, and his sermons, in which he praised the Deity of the Son, were also inscribed *περὶ τῆς θεολογίας, Concerning Theology*.

But, that the *Scope* of the Apostle John was in his *Gospel* to assert the true Deity of Christ against the *Ebionites*¹ and the *Cerinthians*,² Reverend Hartman, in his *Huysbybel in Johannis Euangelium, Prolegomena*, § 4, 5, *pages* 171-189, upholds against the *Illustrious Lampe*, who denies the same.

It made the same argument of the Gospel of *John*, that he was represented by the Ancients by an *Eagle* ascending on high. That is, from the Four Apocalyptic Living Creatures seen by John, Revelation 4:7, after the similar vision of the Cherubs formerly represented to *Ezekiel*, Ezekiel 1:10; 10:14, the Ancients seized the opportunity of representing to themselves the four Evangelists. "A great many, that before us handled the mysteries of the Sacred Scriptures, in these living creatures understood the four Evangelists," says AUGUSTINE, *tractatus* 36, in *Johannem*. How far this might agree with the mind of the Holy Spirit in this vision exhibited to John, or might deviate from the same, this is not the place to consider. After the *Dutch Translators in the marginal notes*³ and others, MARCKIUS and VITRINGA in *Apocalypsin* are able to be consulted on this matter, of whom the former interprets the four Living Creatures as Principal Angels, portrayed in the quaternary number with respect to just so many compass points of the world, so that thus the Prefects of the Church, under the name of Elders, might be joined with the primary Angels. The latter understands, not Angels, but in general all the most excellent Doctors and Ministers of Christ among men under the New Testament throughout all times, especially the Apostles and Apostolical Men. Which of the two more dexterously hits upon the

¹ The Ebionites were a second century Judaizing sect, who insisted upon the keeping of Jewish religious rites and laws. They denied the Deity of Jesus Christ. The existence of a second century heresiarch by the name of Ebion is a matter of some dispute.

² Cerinthus (c. 100) was a heretic: Like the Ebionites, he taught his followers to keep the Jewish law for salvation, and denied the divinity of Jesus; like some Gnostics, he denied that the Supreme God made the world, and believed that the bodyless, spiritual Christ inhabited the man Jesus. He also anticipated a millennium of earthly pleasures after the Second Coming but before the general resurrection.

³ This is a reference to the Dutch translation and annotations, ordered by the Synod of Dort in 1618, published 1637.

scope, I prefer that the Reader examine by a comparison of the arguments on both sides. I now particularly observe that not all of the Ancients applied the *Eagle* to John; but some assign the Eagle to Mark, the Lion to John, as it is to be read in *Epigrammate* of AQUILINUS JUVENCUS, a Christian Poet, who flourished in the fourth century:

*Mark loves to soar between the earth and heaven,
Even as a vigorous Eagle precisely cleaves all things
while gliding.
John roars with the mouth of a Lion, like a roaring
Lion
He thunders, revealing the mysteries of eternal life.*¹

With which agree those things which THEOPHYLACT has in his "Præfatione" in *Marcum*. Others, although joining the Living Creatures to the Evangelists in diverse ways, nevertheless have the *Eagle* as the proper emblem of John. Thus ATHANASIUS, in his *Synopsi Scripturæ, Opera, tome 2, page 155*, assigns the man to Matthew, the calf to Mark, the Lion to Luke, the Eagle to John. AUGUSTINE, both elsewhere, and in *book I, de Consensu Evangelistarum, chapter VI*, thinks to be the most probable the opinion of those that, with the rationale of the entire argument of the individual Gospels considered, not only of the beginning of the books, assigned the Lion to Matthew, the man to Mark, the calf to Luke, the Eagle to John; concerning John he adds this reason: "But John, like an Eagle, flies above the clouds of human infirmity, and regards the Light of immutable truth with the keenest and most constant eyes of the heart." Finally, SEDULIUS, a Christian Poet, *Section V, book I, page 51*,² thus arranges the entire matter:

*Matthew, treating man in general, fulfills this.
Mark roars, like the deep voice a Lion through
wilderness places.
The laws of the Priest Luke upholds with the mouth of
a Young Ox.*

¹ Gaius Vettius Aquilinus Juvencus was a fourth century Christian poet of Spain. He composed a four part poem, entitled *Evangeliorum libri*, in which he sets forth Christ's history in verse. It is debated whether these verses are part of his original authorship.

² Cœlius Sedulius was a fifth century Christian poet, and a presbyter, perhaps residing in Italy. He is most famous for his long poem, *Carmen Paschale*, based on the Gospels.

*Flying after the manner of an Eagle, John in word
rises to the stars.*

As is apparent, Matthew begins from the human genealogy of Christ and the nativity of the Word; Mark starts from the roar of John the Baptist in the desert, where were dens of Lions; Luke derives his preface from the Priesthood of Zechariah, unto which the slaughtering of sacrifices has regard, among which sacrifices Calves were not the least in place, and he makes mention thereafter of the nativity of the Lord in the stable, where oxen and calves are wont to be kept; but John, far more sublime, takes his beginning from the eternal Deity of the Word, aiming high after the likeness of an *Eagle*: see SUICERUS in his *Thesaurus Ecclesiastico*, tome I, columns 1234, 1235, on the word Εὐαγγελιστής/*Evangelist*, and LAMPE in his "Prolegomenis" in *Joannis Evangelium*, book II, chapter V, § 21-23. Now, OUDINETUS,¹ in *Historia Academicarum Inscriptionum*, tome I, page 338, observes that from a seal, which exhibits the consecration of Germanicus, and an eagle carrying him to heaven, some draw out and venerate John the Evangelist.

¹ Remi-Casimir Oudin (1638-1719) was a Premonstratensian monk and scholar, specializing in ecclesiastical history. He converted to Protestantism, and was appointed as an assistant librarian at the University of Leyden.

§ 3: Biblical Uses of “Theology”; and the Personal Word

The words composing the term *Theology* are extant in Holy Scripture: for example, τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the oracles/sayings of God*, Romans 3:2;¹ Hebrews 5:12.² As is apparent, τό λόγιον, *the saying*, and τὰ λόγια, *the sayings*, with this word used substantively, is able to be reckoned as more emphatic than τό ῥῆμα, *the word/utterance*, or even ὁ λόγος, *the word/saying*: for this term among the Greeks denotes, not just any word, but more specifically *an oracle, a divine response*. The Grammarians add that they use λόγια of divine responses given in prose, but χρησµοὺς/*oracles* of divine responses pronounced in verse; nevertheless, this distinction is not abiding, and indeed it does not now particularly apply to our matter: see Henri Estienne’s *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*,³ the *Scholiast of Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian War* on book II, chapter VIII, pages 102, 103, and *the notes on these Scholia*, page 624, number II. And so the sacred Writers by this name most fittingly indicate Oracles set forth by the true God. In passing the Attic elegance of the expression in the construction of the words in Romans 3:2, ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, *that entrusted were the oracles of God*, is able to be observed: for the expression, ἐπιστεύθησαν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τὰ λόγια, *were entrusted to the Jews the oracles*, is not to be supplied here, that λόγια/*oracles* might be the nominative and subject of the clause; thus the word would rather have been ἐπιστεύθη, *was*

¹ Romans 3:2: “Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ).”

² Hebrews 5:12: “For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God (τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ); and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.”

³ Henri Estienne, or Henricus Stephanus (c. 1530-1598), was the eldest son of Robert Estienne, who had printed several famous editions of the Greek New Testament. Henri continued in the family printing business, editing, collating, and preparing many classical works for the press. His most famous work is his *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which was a standard work in Greek lexicography until the nineteenth century.

entrusted, since among the Greeks a neuter plural readily takes a singular verb: but οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια, *the Jews were entrusted with the oracles*, so that λόγια/*oracles* might be in the regular accusative, and constitute the predicate of the clause. Indeed, among the Greeks, especially the Athenians, passive verbs elegantly imitate the signification and case of their words: thus 1 Corinthians 9:17, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, *a dispensation is committed to me*; Galatians 2:7, πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, *to me was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter of the circumcision*; Philippians 3:8, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα ἐζημιώθην, *because of whom I have suffered the loss of all those*: see the Most Illustrious PASOR'S *Grammaticam Græcam sacram Novi Testamenti*, page 373-375, 678, and also his *Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum* on the word πιστεύω, *to trust*.

Ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the word of God*, is more frequently found in the Sacred Writings, but with a twofold signification. For sometimes ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Word of God*, is the personal name of *the Son of God*; which signification of this expression is especially observed in the writings of the Apostle *John*, John 1:1, 14; 1 John 5:7; Revelation 19:13. Indeed, undoubtedly John, in the Gospel of John 1, speaks of the personal and substantial Λόγῳ/*Logos/Word*, asserting that *He was in the beginning, with God, and God Himself, that through Him all things were made, that in Him was life and the light of men, that for a testimony to Him John came, that He came unto His own, by His own He was not received, but to those receiving Him He gave the power τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, to become the sons of God, that finally He was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, seen in the glory of the Only-Begotten of the Father, of whose fullness we all receive grace for grace*. Add 1 John 1:1-3, where He is called ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, *the Word of Life*.

Concerning the reason for the denomination, when the Son of God is called ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Word of God*, there is controversy with the Socinians, who deny the true Deity of the Son¹ (see *Socinus' Explicatione initii capitis 1 Johannis, opera, tome I, page 78; Schlichting² in*

¹ Fausto Paolo Sozzini, or Faustus Socinus (1539-1604), was the father of Socinianism, a rationalistic heresy (denying the Deity of Christ, the satisfaction theory of the atonement, etc.), an aberration of the Reformation.

² Jonas Schlichting (1592-1661) was a theologian of the Socinian Polish Brethren. He wrote commentaries on most of the books of the New

Johannem 1:1, *opera*, tome I, pages 3, 4; Wolzogen¹ in Johannem 1:1, *opera*, pages 714, 715, compared with the *Prolegomenis*, chapter VI, pages 706, 707; *Catechesin Racoviensis* "de Cognitione Personæ Christi", chapter I, questions 80, 81, page 109, where you may read: *From this, that Christ is the Word of God, the divine nature in Christ is not able to be shown, indeed the opposite is gathered. For, since He is the Word of that one God, it appears that He is not that one God.... But Jesus is called the Word or speech of God, because He has related the entire will of God to us, as in the same place John to a lesser degree related it, No one has seen God at any time, etc., John 1:18, just as also in the same sense He is called both the life and the truth: but compare the Most Illustrious ARNOLDI'S² refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ, on the place cited, § 1-4, pages 315, 316; SPANHEIM'S Elenchms Controversiarum, Opera, tome 3, column 813; HEINRICH ALTING'S³ Theologiam elencticam novam, locus 3, pages 109-112; our AUTHOR'S Exercitationes XXXVI, Part VI, Exercitatio textualis § 12), with whom in this cause Hobbes is to be reckoned, who in *Leviathan* and its *Appendix* wrote: "Word in the holy tongue is often taken for the very thing that was decreed or promised, and is thus to be understood in John 1, and aims to seek nothing further concerning the mystery of the Incarnation. Christ is called the *Word* of God, because He was promised from the beginning: in the beginning He was with God, because God had decreed from eternity that He was going to come and assume human flesh. In the same sense, in 1 John 1, He is called *the Word of life* and eternal life, which was with the Father; and, in Revelation 19:13, His name is *the Word of God*, as if John would say, This is He, whom God had decreed from eternity, was going to come and had promised in the beginning of the world." See COCQUIUS' *Hobbesianismi Anatomen*, locus 14, chapter 27, § 3, pages 525, 526.*

It here appears that in the language of λόγου attention is to be

Testament, including the Gospel of John.

¹ Johann Ludwig von Wolzogen (1599-1661) was an Austrian noble (Baron of Tarenfeldt and Freiherr of Neuhausel), and Socinian theologian. He also distinguished himself as an exegete by his commentaries on the Gospels, Acts, James, and Jude.

² Nicolaus Arnoldi (1618-1680) was Professor of Theology at Franeker (1651-1680).

³ Heinrich Altting (1583-1644) was a German Reformed divine, specializing in Ecclesiastical History and Historical Theology. He served as Professor of Theology at Heidelberg (1613-1622), and then Professor of Historical Theology at Groningen (1627-1644).

given to the meaning of *speech* or *word*, more than of *reason*; since, α. it is far more agreeable to the word רִבְרָא/*word* among the Hebrews, to which λόγος here corresponds; β. this is the primary signification to the term λόγου, from the verb λέγω, *I say*; and γ. in the New Testament it is by far the most frequent and almost alone. At the same time, the *Son of God* is able to be called the λόγος/*word*, rather than the ῥῆμα/*word*, with a certain strong regard for the other meaning of *reason*, as if the Son of God should be called *the Rational and Most Wise Word of God*.

Now, the Son is able to be called *the Word of God metonymically*: whether by metonymy of the adjunct in place of the subject, because He is the principal argument/subject of the divine Word, both the prophetic Word formerly, and also the evangelical Word afterward under the New Testament; or by metonymy of the effect in the place of the cause, because God sets forth unto men His entire Word through the Son as the supreme and divine Prophet, not only under the New Testament, Hebrews 1:1, but also under the Old, 1 Peter 1:11.

Yet far more preferably by the name of the Λόγου/*Logos/Word* the person of the Son and His eternal subsistence is declared to us *metaphorically*, as we hold against the Socinians who deny it: for, α. this name is attributed to the *Son*, when mention is made, on the one side of *Jehovah* or the *Father*, on the other side of the *Spirit*, as of divine persons distinguished among themselves by these names; whence the middle name of the *Word* shall be of the same, rather than of a different, order. β. This name is also substituted for the name of the *Son*, which is in Matthew 28:19, just as also *John* attributed to the incarnate *Word* the glory as *of the Only Begotten of the Father*, John 1:14, and he adds that God set forth to us, not the *Word*, but the *Only Begotten Son of God*, τὸν ὄντα εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, *which is in the bosom of the Father*, John 1:18. γ. This name is attributed to Christ, when there is regard, not to the Gospel, which was proclaimed after the Fall, but to the first Creation: whence also then it is evident that it is actually applicable to Him with respect to His eternal subsistence. Just as by this name, δ. He is set forth to us as with God from of old and God Himself, and the cause of all things, and finally assuming flesh as another nature. And so the Son is first and primarily called the Λόγος/*Logos/Word metaphorically*, because, 1. just as a word is distinguished and goes forth from the person speaking, so also the Son by eternal Generation is distinguished and *goes forth* from the Father, by a comparison with Micah 5:1; 2. just

as a word expresses the interior thoughts of the mind, so also the Son perfectly relates the Father as *His Image and Representation*, having the same essence in a distinct subsistence, Hebrews 1:3; John 14:9. Thus BASIL the GREAT explains the name Λόγου/*Logos/ Word* in the case of the Son of God, *Homilia in initio Euangelii Johannis, Opera, tome I, page 435*, Διατί λόγος; ἵνα δειχθῇ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ προῆλθε· διατί λόγος; ὅτι ἀπαθῶς ἐγεννήθη· διατί λόγος; ὅτι εἰκὼν τοῦ γεννήσαντος, ὅλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ δεικνὺς τὸν γεννήσαντα, οὐδὲν ἐκεῖθεν ἀπομερίσας· καὶ τέλειος ὑπάρχων καθ' ἑαυτόν· ὡς καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος λόγος ὅλαν ἡμῶν ἀπεικονίζει τὰν ἔννοιαν, *Why the Word? so that it might be shown that He went forth from the mind. Why the Word? so that it might be shown that He was begotten without suffering. Why the Word? so that it might be shown that He is the image of the one having begotten, showing forth in Himself the whole of the one begetting, taking nothing away from Him; and existing of Himself complete; as also our word expresses our whole thought.* Compare the reason for the denomination Λόγου/*Logos/ Word* given by the Most Illustrious TURRETIN¹ in his *Decade Disputationum, Disputation V*,² § 8-11; by MARCKIUS in his *Exercitationibus textualibus XXXVI, Part VI, Exercitation § 2*, and *Judicio Ecclesiastico laudato, chapter III, § 6, page 79, § 11, pages 101, 102*, in which he also denies against Roëll³ that the name of the *Word* or *Speech*, given to the Son, has regard uniquely or primarily unto the Mediatorial Utterance; but, with the relation of this name to the Office of the Mediator admitted, nevertheless it is primarily referred to the Going Out of the Son from the Father, whom He expresses in His own Person not otherwise than the speech of the mouth expresses our internal Thoughts. Compare also the Great SPANHEIM'S *Decadam theologiarum quinta, § 8, Opera, tome 3, columns 1222, 1223*.

It is asked then, whence did John draw this use of the term

¹ Francis Turretin (1623-1687) was a Genevan Reformed theologian of Italian descent. After studying at Geneva, Leiden, Utrecht, Paris, Saumur, and Montauban, he was appointed as the pastor of the Italian refugee congregation in Geneva (1648), and later Professor of Theology at the academy (1653). His *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* has been heavily influential in Reformed circles, shaping Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology* and Herman Bavinck's *Gereformeerde dogmatiek*.

² That is, "De tribus testibus caelestibus, ex 1 Joanne 5:7".

³ Hermann Alexander Roëll (1653-1718) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and philosopher, serving as Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Franeker (1685-1704) and Professor of Natural Theology at Utrecht (1704-1718).

λόγος/*Logos/Word*, whether from the monuments of the Platonic Philosophy, or from the writings of Philo the Jew,¹ to which *Le Clerc* inclines;² see MARCKIUS' *Exercitationes*, cited immediately after § 14. I respond rather that the Holy Spirit dictated this term to him, consistently with the style of the Old Testament, in which, for example, in Psalm 33:6, the discussion concerns the substantial, creating Word,³ in contradistinction to the word of commandment, concerning which verse 9. Haggai 2:5 is able to be added, which entire passage is explained of the Son of God most truly, and far ἐμφορτικότερως, *more emphatically*, than of a word προφορικῶν/*uttered*; see our AUTHOR'S *Commentarium on this passage*. To which, moreover, our AUTHOR, in his *Exercitationibus textualibus XXXVI*, § 13, *Part III*, joins Isaiah 9:8, since this verse is to be referred, not as a beginning to what follows, but as a conclusion to those things which had preceded in verses 6 and 7; and is to be explained of the sending of the Son of God into the world, and His manifestation among the Jews. The *Dutch Annotators* give it as a thing to be considered also, whether the discussion in 2 Samuel 7:21 concerns the substantial Word of God, בְּעִבּוֹר דְּבָרָהּ וּכְלָבָהּ עֲשִׂיתָ אֶת כָּל־הַגְּדוּלָּהּ, *for thy word's sake, and according to thine own heart, hast thou done all this greatness*, which Word of God in 1 Chronicles 17:19 shall then be called the *Servant of God*, בְּעִבּוֹר עַבְדִּי, *for thy servant's sake*, with the title given κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *preeminently*, to Messiah in the oracles of the Prophets.⁴ BULL,⁵ in his *primitiva et Apostolica Traditione de Jesu Christi Divinitate*, chapter V, pages 24-29, undertakes to prove that JUSTIN Martyr did not

¹ Philo was a first century Jewish scholar of Alexandria, Egypt. In him, one finds a synthesis of Platonic philosophy and Hebrew exegesis and theology.

² Jean Le Clerc (1657-1736) was educated in Geneva, under the tutelage of Philippe Mestrezat and Francis Turretin, and ordained in *circa* 1680. His sympathy for the theology of the Remonstrants made it impossible for him to continue in Geneva. He settled as Professor of Philosophy at Amsterdam (1684-1731). Le Clerc's approach to Scripture was seminal in the development of what would become Higher Criticism.

³ Psalm 33:6: "By the word of the Lord (בְּדִבְרֵי יְהוָה) were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth (וּבְרוּחַ פִּי, *Spirit of His mouth*)."

⁴ See, for example, Isaiah 49:6; Ezekiel 34:23, 24; Haggai 2:23; Zechariah 3:8.

⁵ George Bull (1634-1710) was an Anglican theologian and Bishop of St. David's. He was fully orthodox with respect to his Trinitarian theology, but heterodox with respect to his assertion of the necessity of good works for justification, and therefore sometimes accused of Socinianism.

learn in the School of Plato those things that he discusses περὶ τοῦ Λόγου, concerning the Word. But also THEODORET, in his *de curatione Græcarum Affectionum*, Sermon IV, opera, tome 4, page 534, shows that Plato himself learned from the Scripture of the Hebrews those things which he delivers concerning the Λόγῳ/Word as the maker of the world: Δείκνυσι δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον τὰ πάντα δημιουργοῦντα· ἐκ γὰρ τῆς Ἑβραίων καὶ ταῦτα ἐδιδάχθη γραφῆς, he shows to us the Logos/Word of God fashioning all things; for out of the Scripture of the Hebrews he was taught these things.

It is asked, moreover, whether in the New Testament John alone speaks of the Son of God by this name? Our AUTHOR thinks that this is to be denied, and rather he joins with John the Gospel of Luke 1:2, in which the greatest emphasis and propriety of the words is preserved, if the words be taken of the αὐτόπταις/eye-witnesses and ministers of the substantial Λόγου/Word, comparing 1 John 1:3; 1 Corinthians 4:1: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuales* XXXVII, Part III, § 14. One and another text from the Acts of the Apostles come near, in which either Peter or Paul speaks. To this purpose our AUTHOR, in his *Exercitationibus textualibus* XXXVI, Part III, following Athanasius, relates the words of Peter in Acts 10:36, τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε, etc., the Word which God sent, etc. By an Atticism the accusative here is in the place of a nominative, see PASOR'S *Grammatica Græca sacra Novi Testamenti*, page 667, λόγον in the place of λόγος ὃν ἀπέστειλε, clearly in a manner similar to Matthew 21:42, Λίθον¹ ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; 1 Corinthians 10:16, τὸν ἄρτον² ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν, the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?; so that thus the force of the active verb following influences not only the relative pronoun, but also the preceding substantive noun. GLASSIUS, in *Grammaticorum Sacrorum tractatu* II, canon 20, page 209, says, the relative pronoun sometimes draws its antecedent unto its own case. Now, our AUTHOR thinks that the λόγον/word here declared is best held to be the substantial Word; if you consider, 1. that the sending of this λόγου/word to the children best

¹ The expected form is the nominative, λίθος.

² The expected form is the nominative, ἄρτος.

agrees with Christ, ὃν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, *whom He sent to the children of Israel*; 2. that the words immediately following, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *preaching peace by Jesus Christ*, thus cohere with the former word smoothly and more aptly: For thus we shall have declared here the work of God in sending Christ, which is the preaching of peace among the children of Israel; but also through the names, proper and known, of *Jesus Christ* the more sublime name of the sent Preacher is explained, which was the *Word*; as if it were said that He then sent the *Word* to the Israelites, when through Jesus Christ He preached peace to this people: 3. that the pronoun οὗτός/*He* at the end of the *verse*¹ is not able more suitably and aptly to be referred to another noun than to that of λόγου/*word*, which was set down at the beginning of the *verse*: for the rest are read between commas; but the principal noun λόγος/*word* at the beginning of the *verse*, disconnected from the rest with respect to the construction, has nothing thus far answering to it to perfect the sense; whence, when in the manner of resumptive speech it is said, οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων Κύριος, *He is Lord of all*, this in the manner of a predicate is to be referred to the principal subject, ὁ λόγος, *the Word*: and if it pertain unto those words most nearly preceding, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *Jesus Christ*, ὃς/*who*² would be read rather than οὗτός/*He*:³ but this is true of the *Word* preaching, not of the word preached; for He is Lord of all, not only by providence, but also by grace: 4. that thus admirably are opposed to each other the preceding Sending of τοῦ λόγου, *the Word*, to the Children of Israel, and the consequent universal Dominion: 5. that thus the words of this clause best cohere both with what immediately precedes, and with those things which follow.

In the same manner our AUTHOR, in his *Exercitationibus textualibus* XXXVII, Part III, § 1-3, judges of the words of Paul in Acts 13:26, ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἀπεστάλη, *to you the Word of this salvation is sent*, in which place he urges, α. this emphatic description, ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης, *the Word of this salvation*, as John makes mention of τὸν λόγον τῆς ζωῆς, *the Word of life*;⁴ and

¹ Acts 10:36: "The word which He sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he [οὗτός] is Lord of all):..."

² The relative pronoun.

³ The demonstrative pronoun.

⁴ 1 John 1:1.

perhaps in a sense ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης, *the Word of this salvation*, will be ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας οὗτος, *this Word of salvation*; which sort of description certainly agrees most precisely with the Son of God, σωτηρίῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the salvation of God, the God of our Salvation*: β. *the sending of this λόγου/Word to the Israelites*, comparing this with Acts 10:36: γ. the context, antecedent and consequent, in which there is no express mention of the Gospel of Christ, but rather a repeated mention of Christ Jesus Himself, as raised up by God, indeed as raised up a Savior for Israel;¹ nay more, after *verse 26* Paul repeatedly speaks of the person of Christ only by the pronouns οὗτος, *this man*, and αὐτὸς/*he*, which is hardly able to be referred to any other noun in our text than ὁ λόγος, *the Word*. Now, in both places, Acts 10 and 13, perhaps the Apostles had regard unto the *passage cited*, Isaiah 9:7, 8.

Thus our AUTHOR in the *place cited*, *Exercitation XXXVII, Part III, § 4*, thinks that the words of Paul in Acts 20:32 are referred, not indeed necessarily, but nevertheless more plainly and fully, to the divine person of the Son, than to the word of the Gospel. But it also tends to this, that Paul to Hebrews, who would be aware of this appellation out of the Old Testament, is best judged to have composed the words of Hebrews 4:12 concerning the substantial Λόγῳ/*Word*, unto which end he wishes to be observed, *Exercitationibus textualibus XXXVII, Part III, § 5-13, 1.* both all and the individual things predicated of τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Word of God*, that are here read; and which certainly agree with the word of the Gospel in a sense far weaker, but agree with God and the Son of God with the greatest emphasis: 2. and the context immediately following, in which by the pronoun αὐτὸς/*He*² we are directed to return to the subject of the discussion most recently named, which is not Θεὸς/*God*, but ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Word of God*; just as the things predicated in *verse 13* agree with those things that are said of Λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Word of God*, in *verse 12*, and make for the confirmation of them. In *verse 14*, the Apostle proceeds to speak of *the Son of God*, to a certain extent drawing the language from what precedes. And, that the entire preceding context favors, more than opposes, this

¹ Verse 23.

² Hebrews 4:13: "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his (αὐτοῦ) sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him (αὐτοῦ) with whom we have to do."

exegesis, our AUTHOR most clearly demonstrates. See GOMAR,¹ in *Johannes 1, opera, part I, pages 267, 268a*, who went before our AUTHOR in this observation concerning the Son of God, impressed with the name Λόγος/*Word* in the New Testament, not only by John, but also by Luke and Paul.

However, it is not possible for us to boast against the Jews excessively concerning this phrase, מִימְרָא דִּיּוֹ, *the Word of Jehovah*,² or מִימְרִי, *my Word*,³ found so many times also in the Chaldean Paraphrases when God Himself speaks, as if that denomination of *the Word* therein also is to be referred to the second hypostasis of the Trinity. There are certainly a fair number of places, in which this expression is able best to be explained of the Son of God. Nevertheless, this signification of this expression is not uniform or even necessary. On the contrary, as HACKSPAN⁴ and others observe, it is a certain Chaldean form of speech, in which מִימְרָא/*Word* is the same as נְפֻשׁ/*breath/soul* to the Hebrews, and עֶצֶם/*substance/essence/self* to the Rabbis, in a reciprocal sense, which the divine language is able to exhibit by no pronoun. Thus concerning Solomon you read in Ecclesiastes 1:2, אָמַר בְּמִמְרֵיהֶ, *he said by his word, he said by himself, or under his own power, Vanity of Vanities, etc.*⁵ Genesis 17:2, *I shall give my covenant*, בֵּין מִימְרִי וּבֵינֶךָ, *between my Word and thee*,⁶ that is, בֵּין מִימְרִי וּבֵינִי, *between me and thee*.⁷ Isaiah 42:1, *Behold my servant, Messiah, unto whom I shall approach; mine elect, in whom* מִימְרִי, *my Word, has delighted: I shall put my Holy Spirit upon Him*.⁸ In which place

¹ Francis Gomar (1569-1641), as Professor of Divinity at Leiden (1594), was a colleague and opponent of Jacob Arminius. After the Arminian conflict, he held a variety of academic posts.

² See, for example, Genesis 9:16: "And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God (מִימְרָא דִּיּוֹ, *the Word of Jehovah*, in Targum Onkelos) and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth."

³ See, for example, Genesis 9:12: "And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me (מִימְרִי, *my Word*, in Targum Onkelos) and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations..."

⁴ Theodoricus Hackspan (1607-1659) was a Lutheran divine and eminent Oriental scholar. He served at Altdorf as Professor of Hebrew (1636-1654), and Professor of Theology (1654-1659).

⁵ Thus the Targum.

⁶ In the Targum.

⁷ Thus the Hebrew.

⁸ Thus the Targum.

מִיָּמְרִי, *my Word*, most certainly corresponds to the Hebrew נַפְשִׁי, *my soul*: neither is it able to be understood in any way of Messiah; since *the word of the Lord* is expressly said to have delighted in its servant, Messiah, and to that extent that *word* is distinguished from Messiah. But also at the time of the embellished Paraphrases the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Deity of the Son was already greatly corrupted among the Jews; so that it is hardly likely that this was the mind of the Targumists, to speak of the Son of God under the name of the *word of the Lord*, and thus to express the divine mode of His subsisting.

See concerning this name Λόγου/*Logos/ Word*, attributed to the Son of God, and all, which I have recalled on this occasion, besides our Most Illustrious AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes textuale*, Part III, *Exercitationes* XXXVI, XXXVII, and Part VI, *Exercitation* XXXVI; DEYLING'S¹ *Observationes Sacras*, Part I, *Observation* XLIX; CARPZOV'S² *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*, part II, chapter I, § 6, pages 479-481; SUICERUS' *Thesaurum Ecclesiasticum*, tome II, on the word Λόγος/*Logos*; RITTANGELIUS'³ *Libram Veritatis*, and especially that set before this treatise, namely, JOHANNES VAN DER WAEYEN'S⁴ *Dissertationem de Λόγω adversus Johannes Clericus*.

"Some Theologians say," says our AUTHOR, "that this is Λόγον ἐνυπόστατον, that is, the substantial Word, even ἐνδιάθετον, *the imminent*⁵ Word; although the *Greeks* understand this latter word differently." That is, before the times of Arius,⁶ the Fathers, who had passed from the Platonic to the Christian school, having been soaked in their own philosophical opinions, often spoke very unsuitably and

¹ Salomon Deyling (1677-1755) was a Lutheran divine and Orientalist; he served as Professor of Theology at Leipzig (1721-1755).

² Johann Gottlob Carpzov (1679-1767) was a Lutheran divine and Old Testament scholar. He served at Leipzig as Professor of Theology (1713-1719), and Professor of Hebrew (1719-1730).

³ Johann Stephan Rittangel (1602-1652) was Professor of Oriental Languages at Königsberg, a great authority on Karaite Judaism, and ever a proponent of Jewish-Christian reconciliation.

⁴ Johannes van der Waeyen (1639-1701) was a Reformed divine; he served as Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Franeker (1677-1701).

⁵ That is, *residing in the mind*.

⁶ Arius (c. 250-336) was a presbyter of the church in Alexandria, Egypt. He denied the Son to be of one substance, and co-equal Deity, with the Father. His views precipitated the Arian controversy, and led to the calling of the First Ecumenical Council at Nicea (325).

imprudently concerning divine things and the subsistence of the persons in the Trinity, although it is evident that from another source they perceived better. And among these harsh conceptions concerning divine things ought also to be numbered that they sometimes attribute to the Son a twofold, divine Generation, one from all eternity, by which the Λόγος αἰδῖος, *eternal Word*, was internally in God, just like an infant carried in the maternal womb after conception; the other, just a little before the creation of the world, in the beginning of things, through whom God produced and, as it were, revealed that which had lain hidden in His bowels. And in the prior Generation *Theophilus*¹ says that the Λόγον/*Word* was ἐνδιάθετον/*imminent*; but in the second Generation, προφορικόν/*uttered*: see Doctor WILHELMIIUS' *Prefationem* before the Most Illustrious PAULUS HULSIUS² *Miscellanea Sacra* **** I. Now, BASIL the GREAT, in his *Homilia in initio Euangelii Johannis*, *Opera*, tome I, page 435, explains the Λόγον προφορικόν and ἐνδιάθετον, *Word uttered and imminent*, of human speech and cogitation: Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Λόγου διπλῇ τίς ἐστὶν ἔννοια. ὁ μὲν γὰρ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ διὰ τῆς φωνῆς προφερόμενος· οὗτος ὁ μετὰ τὸ προενεχθῆναι τῷ ἀέρι ἀπολλύμενος. ὁ δὲ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνδιάθετος ἐνυπάρχων ἡμῶν ταῖς καρδίαις, ὁ ἐννοηματικός, *but also there is a certain twofold notion of the Word: For the one is brought forth by the voice; this is released into the air after being uttered: The other is imminent, existing in our hearts, notional*. And ATHANASIUS, in his *Expositione Fidei*, tome I, page 240, denies that the Son of God in either sense is called the λόγον/*Word*, λόγον δὲ οὐ προφορικόν, οὐκ ἐνδιάθετον—ἀλλὰ υἱὸν αὐτοτελεῖ, *nor yet the Word pronounced by elocution, or conceived in the soul by cogitation...but the Son perfect in Himself*.

¹ Theophilus (died c. 183) was Bishop of Antioch. His only remaining writing is his *Ad Autolyicum*, in which he presents an apology for the Christian religion and a polemic against paganism. *Ad Autolyicum* is the earliest extant Christian writing to use the word *Trinity*.

² Paulus Hulsius (1653-1712) was a Reformed theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Groningen (1708-1712).

§ 4: Biblical Uses of “Theology”; and the External Word

But here by the λόγον προφορικόν, *Word uttered*, we understand *the Word brought forth from God Himself to men*, in which sense ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the word of God*, occurs in the places cited by the AUTHOR, and in a great many others. In 1 Peter 1:23, in the words διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever*, ζῶντος καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, *living and abiding forever*, is to be referred to λόγον/*word*, rather than to Θεὸν/*God*: 1. because Peter here is more concerned with the commendation of τοῦ λόγου Θεοῦ, *the word of God*, than of *God Himself*; and, 2. this description of the *word of God* is opposed to the σπορᾶ φθαρτῇ, *perishable seed*, previously mentioned; and, 3. he illustrates at the same time the comparison with the σπορᾶς ἀφάρτου, *imperishable seed*, under which the *Word/Speech of God* comes in this same verse, and so I would not render the text with BEZA,¹ *by the word/speech of God, who liveth and abideth forever*; but *by the word of God, which word liveth and abideth forever*.

And so the term *Theology* ought not to be rejected as altogether ἄγραφος/*unwritten*. Doubtlessly, 1. composites follow the nature of their simple components: but the simple components, or first-formed words, of which the term *Theology* is composed, are not only ἔγγραφοι/*written*, but are also used in Sacred Scripture to signify speech concerning the true God: and therefore the compound word is also rightly used in the same sense. 2. This term has long been used in this sense by the Christian Church; while in the Second Century we now find that JUSTIN *Martyr* made use of the term θεολογεῖν, *to theologize*, in the place of *to speak of divine things*, in *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, page 340,

¹ Theodore Beza (1519-1605) served as Rector of the Academy and Professor of Theology in Geneva. He was the colleague, then successor, of Calvin. He issued a Greek New Testament, and later published his *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*. He authored notable and highly influential theological works, such as *Tractationes Theologicas* and *Summam Totius Christianismi*, as well as poems and contributions to the Huguenot metrical psalter of Clement Marot.

Ἀλλὰ διὰ τί μὲν ἐν ἄλφα πρώτῳ προσετέθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὀνόματι θεολογεῖς, *but thou dost theologize as to why one alpha is added to Abraham's first name.* Then ORIGEN, in his *Against Celsus*, book II, page 104, says of Christ: Αὐτὸς θεολογῶν ἀπήγγειλε τὰ περὶ Θεοῦ τοῖς γνησίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς· ὧν ἵχνη ἐν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις εὐρίσκοντες, ἀφορμὰς ἔχομεν θεολογεῖν, that is, "He discussed the divine words/speeches concerning God before His genuine disciples: of whose instruction finding the footsteps in the Scriptures, we thence have occasion to theologize;" and so onward. 3. Moreover, it is most apt to denote this discipline; but the τεχνικὰ/*technical* terms, which properly and emphatically declare their subject, are not rashly to be rejected.

If someone should then say: A word ἔγγραφος/*written* ought to be preferable to one ἀγράφω/*unwritten*: but Theology is a word ἄγραφος/*unwritten*; while, on the other hand, certain Synonyms of it are ἔγγραφα/*written*. Responses: 1. It is demonstrated from what has already been said that the minor is not simply true: it is ἄγραφος/*unwritten* with respect to sound, but not with respect to sense; with respect to syllables and formally, but not materially. 2. We limit the major; unless an ἄγραφος/*unwritten* word is to be employed for the sake of exposition, to explain divine things, or to guard against errors, unto which end we make use of the words *Trinity*, ὁμοουσίου/*homoousios/same-substance*, *Original Sin*, etc. It is one thing to make use of a word that is ἄγραφος/*unwritten* αὐτολεξεῖ, *in express terms*; it is quite another to devise dogmas beyond Scripture: the latter is altogether sinful, but not the former.

The *pagans* abused this term, but we claim a genuine use for it: just as also in the Scripture itself, the terms Θεοῦ/*God*, ἐκκλησίας/*church*, ἐπισκόπου/*bishop*, etc., are used in a sounder, holier, and sublimer sense than was done formerly among the Gentiles.

§ 5: Synonyms of “Theology”

Among other Synonyms of the term *Theology* found in Scripture, our AUTHOR observes what is called *the Form/Type of doctrine*, Romans 6:17, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς, *but ye have obeyed from the heart that form/type of doctrine unto which ye were delivered for instruction*, τύπον/type¹ in the place of τύπω/type,² because the relative ὃν/which precedes; what it has subjoined to itself here, it attracts to its own case; compare Acts 21:16, ἄγοντες παρ’ ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν, Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, *bringing one, with whom we should lodge, Mnason of Cyprus, etc.*:³ see GLASSIUS’ *Grammaticorum Sacrorum tractatum* II, canon 20, page 209.

Our Most Illustrious AUTHOR also adds as a Synonym, μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας, *the form of knowledge and of the truth*, out of Romans 2:20, διδάσκαλον— ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, *a teacher...having the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law*. It is evident that, while μορφή is the form of a thing, both external, by which it is discerned, and internal, by which it is constituted; μόρφωσις (a verbal noun from μορφόω, *to form, to shape, to delineate, to give form*) is nothing other than *delineation, formation*. Therefore, when Paul says that the Jew “is confident that he is a guide of the blind, a light to those that are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, *having the form of knowledge of the truth in the law*,” this μόρφωσις/form/formation shall denote, not a vain and empty sort of knowledge, nor the informing of others, but the form, or delineation, of saving wisdom and truth, exhibited in the Scriptures and also its Legal part: or you might read, *having a representation of knowledge, etc.*, with the sense continued, so that these things might perhaps have regard unto the persuasion of the Jew: or with BEZA you might

¹ In the Accusative case.

² In the Dative case. The verb ὑπακούω, *to obey*, normally takes the Dative case.

³ The verb ἄγω, *to lead*, normally takes an accusative object, but, because the preceding relative ᾧ/whom is Dative, Μνάσωνί/Mnason has also been set down in the Dative.

translate it, *because thou hast*, so that these things might declare the foundation of the prior confidence: see our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*, Disputation VII, text XVII, page 349.

But also unto the same purpose our AUTHOR relates the other passage in which the term *μόρφωσις*/form/formation is found, namely, 2 Timothy 3:5, where *μόρφωσις εὐσεβείας*, a form of godliness, occurs. This phrase many refer to an external and hypocritical *show* and mask of *Piety*; which Paul would set over against its true exercise and power, through which alone one prevails before God, and which is of the integrity of the heart. Our AUTHOR rather translates it, *the representation of piety*, yet not in an active sense with Erasmus, *Vatablus*,¹ *Estius*,² as if they were *ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας*, having a form of godliness, that shape others in piety and prescribe what is needful to be done, although they themselves do not at all apply those things; to such an extent that *μόρφωσις*/form would be education: but in a passive sense, in such a way that *μόρφωσις εὐσεβείας*, a form of godliness, would be *ὑποτύπωσις*, a delineation, pattern, doctrine, form, norm of Piety, which they, concerning whom the Apostle speaks, were holding as having been made known to themselves, and were professing externally. For the confirmation of this exegesis he observes, 1. that this signification of the term *μορφώσεως* is especially natural in context, and singular in the Scripture of the New Testament, by a comparison with that passage, Romans 2:20, which has just now been explained. 2. That the Apostle continues in this verse 5 a description of the men, concerning whom he had also treated in verses 2-4; but those are openly impious, and impudently attached to disgraceful acts of every sort, to such an extent

¹ Francis Vatablus (c. 1485-1547) was a prominent Hebrew scholar, doing much to stimulate Hebraic studies in France. He was appointed to the chair of Hebrew in Paris (1531). Because of some consonance with Lutheran doctrine, his annotations (*Annotiones in Vetus et Novum Testamentum*), compiled by his auditors, were regarded with the utmost esteem among Protestants, but with a measure of suspicion and concern by Roman Catholics. Consequently, the theologians of Salamanca produced their own edition of Vatablus' annotations for their revision of the Latin Bible (1584).

² William Estius (1542-1613) labored first as a lecturer on Divinity, then as the Chancellor at Doway. Theologically, he bears the imprint of the modified Augustinianism of Michael Baius. In his commentary writing, as exemplified in his *Commentarii in Sacram Scripturam* and *Commentarii in Epistolas Apostolicas*, he focuses on the literal meaning of the text; and he is widely regarded for his exegetical skill and judgment.

that to them no *appearance*, either common, or extraordinary, of piety is able to be attributed in any way; it is indeed rendered correctly, *to have a ὑποτύπωσιν/sketch of piety*, while many impious men of this sort are among them, that hear, read, and profess themselves to accept the doctrine of Piety, while they take the name of true Christians, *in comparison with Titus 1:16*. 3. That in this way plain and without any difficulty is the opposition between *μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, a form of godliness*, and *δύναμιν αὐτῆς, the power of it*, whether of Godliness, or of the same *μορφώσεως/form*. Since this is the *power*, which saving doctrine, commending and declaring piety through the work of the Spirit, has in the faithful, that it converts the soul, and draws it from vices unto virtues. Now, this power they deny in their persons and by their example, who, although hearing and professing this doctrine, yet are unwilling to yield to it. 4. He observes that this is supported by the admonition which is subjoined to these words, *καὶ τούτους ἀποτρέπου, and from these turn away*. For this, α. supposes that these men are able to be identified, which concerning hypocrites is often quite difficult; β. appears to involve a certain opposition to those that were described in 2 Timothy 2:16-18, 23, 25, namely, heretics and those opposing sound doctrine, who consequently were not receiving the doctrine and true form of Piety. But in addition to these the Apostle wishes those to be avoided that were retaining pure doctrine, but were dishonoring it by wicked behavior: see again our AUTHOR'S *Exercitationes Miscellaneas, Disputation VII, text XVII, page 345-354*.

§ 6: Homonyms of “Theology”

After Etymology and Synonymy follows *Homonymy*. In which it is to be observed that the term *Theology* is used of Theology, either *False*, or *True*, which latter we embrace as worthy of exposition.

Theology is said to be called *False*, either *equivocally* or by *catachresis*,¹ as it errs to a greater or lesser extent; in almost the same manner the Devil also goes by the name of a *God*, 2 Corinthians 4:4. This False Theology is best able to be described as *fourfold*, *Pseudo-Christian*, *Mohammadan*, *contemporary Jewish*, and *Gentile*. Now, the limitations, with which we are circumscribed, will not bear for us to sketch out these *False Theologies* κατὰ μέρος, in detail.

With respect to the *Pseudo-Christianity of Heretics*: These *heresies* are either more ancient or recent. Those *More Ancient* are set forth in Ecclesiastical History by their individual ages: and, as far as the earlier ages are concerned, a Catalogue of Heresies among the Fathers was composed by TERTULLIAN,² EPIPHANIUS,³ THEODORET,⁴ PHILASTRIUS,⁵ and also AUGUSTINE; whose *Liber de Hæresibus*, illustrated by the splendid *Commentario* of the most illustrious DANÆUS,⁶ is read among the *Opuscula* of the latter. Add from More Recent Authors STAPFER’S⁷ Appendix concerning the Heresies of the first ages of the Christian Church, *Theologicis polemicis*, tome 5, pages 313-452, who also treats of *Pelagianism*,⁸ but separately, *Theologicis polemicis*,

¹ That is, an improper use of terms.

² Tertullian wrote several works against heresy, including *Adversus Gnosticos*, *Scorpice*, *Adversus Praxeam*, *Adversus Marcionem*. The *Adversus Omnes Hæreses*, traditionally ascribed to him, is thought by many to be spurious.

³ *Panarion (Medicine-Chest against Heresies)*.

⁴ *Hæreticarum fabularum compendium*.

⁵ *Diversarum Hereseon Liber*.

⁶ Lambert Danæus (c. 1530-1596) was a French minister and theologian. He labored as a pastor and Professor of Divinity at Geneva, and then at Leiden.

⁷ John Frederick Stapfer (1708-1775) was a Swiss Reformed divine of the first order. He served as a Pastor in the canton in Berne. His *Institutiones theologicæ, polemicæ, universæ, ordine scientifico dispositæ* ranks among the best elenctic theologies.

⁸ Pelagius (c. 354-c. 420/440) was an opponent of Augustine; he denied Augustine’s doctrine of total depravity and the freeness and sovereignty of God’s grace.

tome 4, chapter XVI, pages 483-524; likewise *Naamlyst der ketters volgens de order der Eeuwen* in PICTET'S¹ *Theologia Christiana*, volume 3, pages 217-254.

The *more recent* Pseudo-Christianity is either of the *Papists*, or *Socinians*, or *other Heretics*, for example, the *Enthusiasts*, *Arminians*, etc., concerning whose Errors and opinions ought to be consulted the *Controversiarum Elenchus*, for example, of Frederick Spanheim the Younger, PICTET'S *Syllabus Controversiarum*, HOORNBEECK'S *Summa Controversiarum*; and also *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, among which that of the Most Illustrious FRANCIS TURRETIN especially deserves to be commended.

In particular, concerning *Popery* are able to be added CHAMIER'S² *Panstratia Catholica*, 5 tomes, 2 volumes in *folio*; or FRIEDRICH SPANHEIM'S³ *Chamierus contractus*, likewise in *folio*; RIVET'S⁴ *Collegium Controversiarum inter Orthodoxos et Pontificios*, which is found in tome 2 of his *Opera*, and also his *Catholicus Orthodoxus*, which you have in tome 3 of his *Opera*; AMES'S⁵ *Bellarminus enervatus*;

¹ Benedict Pictet (1655-1724) was a Swiss Reformed theologian, and cousin of the great Francis Turretin. He served as a pastor in Geneva, and was appointed Professor of Theology in 1686. He is a transitional figure, having been influenced both by Genevan theological orthodoxy and by some measure of Enlightenment philosophy. Among other works, he wrote *Theologiam Christianam* and *Morale chrétienne*.

² Daniel Chamier (1565-1621) was a Huguenot theologian. He studied at the University of Orange and at Geneva under Theodore Beza. After his ordination, he was installed as pastor at Montélimar. In 1607, he established an academy at Montpellier, and served there for a time as professor, concluding his career as Professor of Theology at Montauban (1612).

³ Friedrich Spanheim the Elder (1600-1649) studied at Heidelberg and Geneva. He served the academy at Geneva, first as Professor of Philosophy, then as a member of the theological faculty, and finally as rector. In 1642, he was appointed as Professor of Theology at Leiden, and became a prominent defender of Calvinistic orthodoxy against Amyraldianism.

⁴ Andrew Rivet (1573-1651) was a Huguenot minister and divine. He ministered at Sedan and at Thouara; he went on to teach at the University of Leiden (1619-1632) and at the college at Breda. His influence among Protestants extended well beyond France.

⁵ William Ames (1576-1633) was taught by William Perkins and Paul Bayne. Because of his strict Puritan views, he departed from England for Holland. At the Synod of Dort, Ames served as adviser to Johannes Bogerman, the synod's president. Later, he was appointed as a professor at Franeker (1622). His *Medulla Theologiæ* was heavily influential throughout the Reformed world.

CABELJAUW'S¹ *Catholyk Memorie-voek*; STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 4, chapter XIV, pages 67-334; and many similar works. HOORNBEECK discusses Popery in his *Summa Controversiarum*, book IV, pages 210-347, where he advises that there is to be careful observation of: 1. Popery's rise, first in corrupt rites, then in order, next in worship, Sacraments, government, and finally doctrines; 2. its development from the time of Boniface III in the year 606² and thereafter; 3. its ὕψος/height in the time of Gregory VII, made Pope in the year 1073;³ 4. its decline, through much opposition, especially of the Waldenses,⁴ whom many have followed in the Reformation; 5. the desperate state of Popery, in the Tridentine Council of the year 1545,⁵ and thereafter. That the doctrine of the Papal Church is a pallium stitched together from the tattered rags of Old heresies, our AUTHOR teaches in *Oratione* II, after *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*. Concerning Popery, or concerning the Principles of the Roman Church, see also the discussion of LEYDEKKER in his *Veritate Euangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XI.

The heresy of the *Socinians* began in the middle of the Sixteenth Century. It has its name from the two principal authors of the sect, 1. *Laelius Socinus* of Siena, who died in Zurich in the year 1562 at the age of thirty-seven;⁶ 2. *Faustus Socinus*, who was born in the year 1539, in Siena

¹ Pieter Cabeljauw (c. 1608-1668) was a Reformed theologian.

² Boniface III was elected in 606, but did not take up the office until 607 (and served less than a year). He is significant in the annals of the Papacy in that, due to his relationship with the Byzantine Emperor Phocas, he was able to secure for the Bishop of Rome the title of *Universal Bishop*.

³ Hildebrand of Sovana (c. 1020-1085) was elected Pope in 1073, taking the name Gregory VII. Gregory VII was a reforming pope, condemning simony and confirming celibacy among the clergy. He is most remembered for his conflict with Emperor Henry IV, in which he asserted the prerogatives of the papacy, requiring Henry to recognize his bans and excommunications, and reserving the appointment of bishops for himself. Gregory VII did much to advance the power and pretensions of his office.

⁴ The Waldenses were a medieval, proto-Reformation group, scattered throughout south-eastern France and northern Italy; they were committed to the study of the Scriptures (for the correction of doctrinal error in the Church), and the preaching of God's Word.

⁵ The Council of Trent was an Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church. It met from 1545-1563. It was decidedly a Counter-Reformation council, defining Roman Catholic doctrine as over against that of the Reformation.

⁶ Lelio Sozzini (1525-1562) was an Italian humanist and anti-Trinitarian

of Italy; after he was made the heir of the Library and Manuscripts of his Uncle in 1562, he lived in Italy, passing his time in the hall of the Duke of Florence; thence he went to Basel in the year 1574, afterwards called out unto Transylvania in the year 1577; finally he withdrew into Poland in the year 1579, where he lived both at Kraków, then at Luslawice, in which district he died in the year 1604 at the age of sixty-five. This he did in all places: the dictates and theology of his Uncle he imbibed and developed to the fullest extent. Beginning from the year 1570 he wrote many books. Socinus obtained many followers, who undertook to disseminate the new doctrines, especially in the regions of Transylvania and Poland, and gradually withdrew into separate assemblies, indeed in Poland beginning from the year 1562: see HOORNBEECK'S *Summam Controversiarum*, book VII, pages 441-454; and his *Apparatum ad Controversias et Disputationes Socinianas*: who also, as equal to all the rest together, is to be consulted on the Socinian Controversies in his *Socinianismo confutato*, which he wrote in 3 volumes quarto. Add the Most Illustrious CLOPPENBURG'S¹ several tractates in tome 2 of his *Opera*; ARNOLDI'S *Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*; MARESIUS'² *Hydrum Socinianismi expugnatam adversus Volkelium*³ *de vera Religione*, 3 volumes in quarto; STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 3, chapter XII, which treats of Socinianism and the Anti-trinitarians, pages 350-583; and, that I might mention no more, among the Lutherans ABRAHAM CALOVIVS'⁴ *Scripta Anti-Sociniana*, 3 volumes in folio. Concerning Socinianism see also

reformer. His principal significance is in the influence that he had over his nephew, Fausto Sozzini.

¹ Johann Cloppenburg (1592-1652) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and controversialist. He studied at the University of Leiden, and held various ministerial posts until his appointment as professor at the University of Harderwijk (1641), and then at Franeker (1643). He was a lifelong friend of Voetius, and colleague of Cocceius at Franeker.

² Maresius, or Samuel Desmarets (1599-1673), was a French Huguenot minister and polemist. He held various ministerial posts, and served as Professor of Theology at Sedan (1625-1636), and at Groningen (1643-1673).

³ Johann Völkel (c. 1565-1616) was a German Socinian. His *De vera religione* was the first major systematic presentation of Socinian doctrine published at the Racovian Academy.

⁴ Abraham Calovius (1612-1686) was a champion of Lutheran orthodoxy. He served the University of Wittenberg as Professor of Theology, and later as general superintendent. He opposed Socinianism, Roman Catholicism, and Calvinism, denying the possibility of the salvation of any of these. His *Systema locorum theologicorum* stands at the apex of Lutheran scholastic orthodoxy.

LEYDEKKER'S *Veritatem Euangelicam triumphantem*, tome I, book I, chapter IX; and WEISMANN'S¹ *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Novi Testamenti*, part 2, Century XVII, § XIX, pages 521-567. Concerning the Agreement of the Errors of the Socinians with more ancient heresies see MARCKIUS' *Orationem* IV, after his *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*.

Concerning the *Enthusiasts* see HOORNBEECK'S *Summam Controversiarum*, book VI, pages 401 and following; likewise his tractate *de Paradoxis et heterodoxis Weigelianis*.² Against the men of this family see, among others, JOHANNES CROCIUS'³ *Anti-Weigelium*; and, against the Enthusiasts together, STAPFER'S *Theologicae polemicæ*, tome 4, chapter XV, pages 335-482, in which he treats generally of the Fanatics, specifically of the hypotheses of the Quakers, Antoinette Bourignon,⁴ Pierre Poiret,⁵ Valentin Weigel, Jacob Böhme,⁶ the Pseudo-mystics, Dippelius;⁷ see also GERARD CROESE'S⁸ *Historiam Quakerianam*; WEISMANN'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Novi Testamenti*, part 2, Century XVII, in which he relates the History of the Quakers, § XIX, pages 567-598. Concerning the agreement between the ancient and modern Enthusiastical Errors see the discussion of our Most Illustrious AUTHOR

¹ Christian Eberhard Weismann (1677-1747) was Professor of Theology at the University of Tübingen.

² Valentin Weigel (1533-1588) was a German theologian and mystic. He served as a Lutheran pastor at Zschopau, and wrote voluminously. He kept his more radical ideas to himself, and lived peacefully. Contrary to the dogmatic tendency of the age, Weigel believed that internal illumination is superior to all external means of spiritual knowledge.

³ Johannes Crocius (1590-1659) was a Reformed theologian. He was appointed as Professor of Theology at Marburg (1618), at Kassel (1629), and then again at Marburg (1653).

⁴ Antoinette Bourignon (1616-1680) was born in French Flanders. She was a mystic, believing that she had been specially chosen by God to restore true Christianity. Her influence extended through the Dutch Republic unto Germany and Scotland.

⁵ Pierre Poiret (1646-1719) was a French mystic, and disciple of Antoinette Bourignon, publishing her works (as well as those of other mystics, ancient and modern).

⁶ Jacob Böhme (1575-1624) was a German theologian and mystic. In his formative years, he was influenced by the writings of Weigel and Schwenckfeld. Although Böhme had no formal education, he wrote prolifically, and had an enthusiastic following.

⁷ John Conrad Dippel (1673-1734) was a Hessian, eccentric, pietistic divine, and alchemist.

⁸ Gerard Croese (1642-1710) was a Dutch pastor and theologian.

in his *Oratione* III, after his *Exercitationes Miscellaneas*.

Concerning *Anabaptism* HOORNBEECK treated in his *Summa Controversiarum*, book V, pages 347-400; WEISMANN, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti*, part 1, Century XVI, § LXI, pages 1694-1699, and part 2, Century XVII, § XX, pages 598-620. Against their errors these are to be consulted before all others: CLOPPENBURG'S *Gangrænam Theologiæ Anabaptisticæ*, published in forty-eight disputations; FREDERICK SPANHEIM'S¹ *Disputationum theologicarum*, part 2, which in thirty-two disputations takes in a number of celebrated Anti-anabaptistical controversies, and in particular in the first Disputation traces the origin, progress, sects, names, and dogmas of the Anabaptists; and also the Reverend DORESLAER and AUSTRO-SYLVIVUS' *tegen de Wederdooperen*;² likewise STAPFER'S *Theologiæ polemicæ*, tome 5, chapter XVIII, pages 1-55.

Concerning the *Arminians* the Most Illustrious HOORNBEECK treats in his *Summa Controversiarum*, book VIII. Against their errors see the Most Illustrious AMES' *Scripta Anti-Synodalia*, and his *rescriptionem ad Grevinchovium*;³ the *Censuram Confessionis Remonstrantium*, written by the Professors of Leiden;⁴ the Most Illustrious JACOBUS TRIGLAND the Elder's⁵ *Antapologiam*, which writing on these controversies is to be preferred before all; the Most Illustrious PIERRE DU MOULIN'S⁶ *Anatomen Arminianismi*; the Most Illustrious ANTONIUS WALÆUS' *Responsionem ad Corvini Censuram in Anatomen Arminianismi Petri Molinæi*; the Most Illustrious JAN VAN DEN HONERT'S⁷ *de Gratia particulari*;

¹ That is, the Elder.

² Petrus Jakobus Austro-Sylvius (died 1647) was a Reformed Pastor in North Holland. He was commissioned by the synod of North Holland to prepare a refutation of the errors of the Mennonites. Progress on the work was slow until Abraham à Doeslaer (died 1655), a learned Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian, was appointed to help (1627). The result is a elaborate and careful comparison between the doctrines of the Reformed and of the Mennonites.

³ Nicolaas Grevinckhoven (died 1632) was a Dutch minister, and virulent Remonstrant polemicist.

⁴ Namely, Johannes Polyander, Andre Rivet, and Antonius Walæus.

⁵ Jacobus Trigland the Elder (1583-1654) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian. He was deputed by the Synod of North Holland to the Synod of Dort; he was a member of the committee appointed to draw up the Canons of that illustrious Synod. In 1633, he became Professor of Theology at Leiden.

⁶ Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658) was a Huguenot pastor and theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Sedan (1621-1658).

⁷ Jan van den Honert (1693-1758) was a Dutch Reformed theologian. He

STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 4, chapter XVII, pages 525-606; and many more. Concerning Arminianism see also LEYDEKKER'S *Veritatem Evangelicam triumphantem*, tome I, book I, chapter X. That the opinion of the Counter-Remonstrants is not new, but that the most excellent Theologians everywhere in the Reformed world, with respect to the controversies with the Remonstrants, have for a long time favored the contrary doctrine, ADRIÆN JORISZ SMOUT¹ has endeavored to show in his tract called *Eendragt van over de uyftig Schriften tegen't Pelagiaansdom*, etc., published in 1609. The Arminians by another name are called *Remonstrants* from a certain writing, which they call *Remonstrantie*, delivered to the Princes of Holland in the month of July, 1610, concerning which TRIGLAND discusses at greater length in his *Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen*, volume 4, pages 521-552. LAMPE judges too benignly of the Arminians in his *Introductione ad Catechesin Heidelbergensem*, question 7, number I, compared with question 14, where he writes that the Reformed, the Lutherans, and ἐπιεικεῖς, *men meet, more than others among the Arminians* and Anabaptists pertain to the Church of Protestants: all whom he asserts to be united in the foundation of the faith, and hence that all γνήσια/*legitimate members of this Church of Protestants are, not only to tolerate each other, but also to extend the right hand of brotherhood to each other after the likeness of the true Philadelphia*.

The *Mohammadan* Theology of the *Turks, Arabs, Persians*, etc., has its name from *Muhammad* the Arab, a most cunning imposter, who began to put forth his own revelations in his fortieth year of age, in the year 612 of the common Era; while the time of the rise of Mohammadanism is reckoned to begin with the Hegira of the Arabs in the year 622 of the Dionysian Era,² on the sixteenth day of July; namely, at which time Muhammad, who had begun to scatter the seeds of his new religion in Mecca, a chief city of the Arabian desert, being sought by the Magistrate of this city, secretly fled from Mecca to Medina, making use of a camel, with a multitude of his compatriots and dependents following. The *principium* and rule of the Mohammadan sect is the *Alcoran*. The chief head of the Religion concerns *Muhammad* the Prophet, sent by God, who

served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1727-1734), and later at Leiden (1734-1758).

¹ Adriæn Jorisz Smout (c. 1580-1646) was a Dutch Reformed minister.

² This is the *Anno Domini* dating system, devised by Dionysius Exiguus (c. 470-c. 544), a Scythian monk, also remembered for his contributions to canon law.

to the extent that he is greater than Christ, by so much he outshined Moses; while with the *Holy Trinity they deny* in particular the *Deity of Christ*, and His *Satisfaction* for the sins of His people. Now, Muhammad, so that he might propagate his new Religion all the more easily and successfully, astutely conflated it from various observances and rites; partly from the old Arabism and Gentilism, partly from Judaism, partly from the impure founts of the Gnostics, and other heresies distracting Christians at that time, Manichean,¹ Arian, Nestorian:² for in this manner he sought to capture the goodwill of the Arabs, Gentiles, Jews, and Heretics. The imposter died just over the age of sixty in the year of our Lord 632. Among his followers, the names of the various sects are reckoned at seventy-two. Now, the principal Schism among the Mohammadans arose upon the occasion of a controversy concerning the right of succession in the principate: although Muhammad, bereft of male offspring, had designated his son-in-law Ali as successor; his three father-in-laws had first claimed the succession for themselves, who also were the first of the Caliphs³ before Ali, then about to succeed: hence in the following time some held Ali and his posterity as the legitimate successors of Muhammad, others otherwise: the Persians and even the Indians sided with the former; the Saracens, Egyptians, Turks, and Mongols sided with the latter: see *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Century VII, even indeed SPANHEIM'S *Historiam*, Century VII, Chapter VII, columns 1206-1218, and HOORNBEECK'S *Summam Controversiarum*, book III, pages 75-210, in which you will see Mohammadanism summarily explained. The Illustrious GROTIUS⁴ gives a refutation of Mohammadanism in his *De Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book 6.

¹ Manichæism was a dualistic Pseudo-Christianity. It was founded by a Persian prophet by the name of Mani (c. 216-276). It thrived after its first founding until the seventh century, and exerted influence from the Roman Empire to China.

² Nestorius (c. 386-451) taught that in Christ, there are not only two natures, but two persons, Jesus of Nazareth and the eternal Son of God. Some believe that this was not actually Nestorius' view, but rather his opponents' caricature of his beliefs.

³ Namely, Abu Bakr as-Siddiq, Umar ibn al-Khattab, and Uthman ibn Affan.

⁴ Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) distinguished himself in the field of international law, but he was interested in many fields of learning, including Christian apologetics, theology, and Biblical criticism and exegesis. His dual interest in international law and theology caused him to run afoul of civil authorities: Embracing Arminian doctrine, he was imprisoned from 1618-1621 after the Synod of Dort declared against the position.

STAPFER explains, and also refutes, Mohammadanism in his *Theologicæ polemiciæ*, tome 3, chapter XI, section 2, pages 289-349, where, in § 43-67, pages 314-322, he also superficially makes mention of those things which the most Illustrious RELAND¹ in his *libris de Religione Mohammedica* argues to have been agreed upon as attributed to the Mohammadans without cause. Furthermore, against the *θεοπνευστία*/inspiration of the Alcoran, consult Chapter II, § 9, 28. Concerning the Mohammadan Religion, and those who have expended themselves in the refutation of Mohammadanism, see in addition BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1404-1406a.

Our AUTHOR does not mention *Judaism* simply, but he calls it *contemporary Judaism*, for ancient Judaism under the Old Testament was alone embracing true Religion: but, after the Gospel was spurned and Jesus of Nazareth the true Messiah was rejected, the Jews gradually deviated more and more in many topics from the pure Theology of their ancestors; with another *principium* of the Faith, in addition to the Old Testament, adopted also, that is, the *Talmud*; as if that book contained the oral traditions previously entrusted to Moses, and until writing of the *Talmud* propagated *ἀγράφως*, *without writing*. See concerning contemporary Judaism and against it, HOORNBEECK'S *Summam Controversiarum*, book II, and his *libros VIII pro convincendis et converendis Judæis*: add GISEBERTUS VOETIUS² *de Judaismo Disputationum theologicarum*, part II, pages 77-124; ANTONIUS HULSIUS³ *Theologiam Judaicam et Nucleum Prophetiæ*; GOUSSET'S⁴ *Veritatem salutiferam*; MAJUS⁵ *Synopsin Theologiæ Judaicæ*; à LENT'S¹ *Theologiam Judaicam*

¹ Adriaan Reland (1676-1718) was a Dutch scholar. He was appointed to the University of Utrecht, first as Professor of Oriental languages (1701-1713), then as Professor of Sacred Antiquities (1713-1718).

² Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676) was a Dutch Reformed minister and theologian. In 1619, he attended the Synod of Dort as its youngest member. Some years later he was appointed as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1636-1676).

³ Antonius Hulsius (1615-1685) was a Dutch Reformed philologist and theologian.

⁴ Jacques Gousset (1635-1704) was a French Reformed philologist and theologian. He studied under Louis Cappel at Saumur, and was ordained to the ministry at Poitiers. He left France in 1685, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and served as Professor of Greek at Groningen (1691-1704).

⁵ Johann Heinrich Majus, Senior (1653-1719) was a German Lutheran philologist, theologian, and historian. He served as Professor of Theology at Giessen (1688-1719).

modernam; STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 3, chapter XI, section I, which concerns *Judaism*, pages 1-288; but also RAMÓN MARTÍ the *Catalan*, of the Order of Preachers, who with respect to age far preceded the rest,² who wrote *Pugionem Fidei adversus Mauros et Judæos*, Section 13, in the year 1278. Now, that book was hidden in the monasteries of the Order of the Dominicans for almost four hundred years, until JOSEPHUS DE VOISIN³ published it, with his *Observationibus* added, at *Paris*, 1651. But the Most Illustrious JOHANN BENEDICT CARPZOV⁴ supervised a new edition of the *Pugionis* and also of the notes of *Voisin*, with an *Introductione* upon Jewish Theology and the reading of Ramon and other Authors of that sort. See BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 7, tome 2, pages 1144-1147a, who in § 10, pages 1395b-1403a, sets forth those things which are required to combat contemporary Judaism, and he commemorates at the same time those who have already exerted themselves in this gymnasium. GROTIUS defends the Truth of the Christian Religion against the *Jews* in his *De Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book V, showing that the Jews ought to consider the Miracles of Jesus as sufficiently proven, § 2-5; resolving the supposed objection from the discrepancy between the law of Moses and the law of Jesus, § 6-12; proving, moreover, that a choice Messiah was promised, and that He is Jesus of Nazareth, § 13-20; and, finally, resolving the objection that multiple Gods are worshipped by the Christians, and that the human nature is adored by them, § 22.

Finally, the *Gentilism* of the *Pagans*, whether ancient, or even contemporary, is mentioned. Concerning this HOORNBEECK'S *liber primus Summæ Controversiarum* is to be consulted, and his *duo* golden *libri de Conversione Indorum et Gentilium*; in which you will see set forth the Gentilism first of the Ancients, the Chaldeans, Sabæans,⁵ Egyptians,

¹ Johann à Lent (1654-1696) was a Reformed theologian. He was Professor of Church History, Hebrew, and Syriac at Herborn (1686-1696).

² Ramon Martí (died 1284) was a Catalan Dominican friar and theologian. In 1250, he was appointed by the provincial chapter, together with seven others, to study the oriental languages for the purpose of mission work among the Jews and the Moors.

³ Joseph de Voisin (died c. 1685) was a French priest, expert in Hebraic and Rabbinical learning.

⁴ Johann Benedict Carpzov II (1639-1699) was a Lutheran theologian and Hebraist. He served at the University of Leipzig, first, as Professor of Moral Philosophy (1665-1668), then, as Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages (1668-1684), and, finally, as Professor of Theology (1684-1699).

⁵ The Sabæans were the ancient inhabitants of the southwestern portion of the

Greeks, Romans, and Germans; then the contemporary Gentilism of the Laplanders¹ of the Europeans; of the Africans; of the Americans; of the Asians, both of the eastern Indians, and of the Chinese and the adjacent islands, both of the Japanese, and of the Tartars. He commemorates also the Fathers of the Church that exerted themselves in their writings for the overturning of Gentilism, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras,² Theophilus, Tatian,³ Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius in his *Præparatione Euangelica*, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, from among the Greeks; and among the Latins, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Julius Firmicus,⁴ Prudentius, and Augustine. Now, to him that is freer to extend his studies, he is able to turn over the vast work of the Most Illustrious GERHARD JOHANN VOSSIUS,⁵ *de Theologia Gentili*, which constituted *tome* 5 of his *Operum in folio*. GROTIUS learnedly and vigorously discredits *Paganism* in his *De Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, book IV, asserting in § 2 that there is only One God; that created minds are good or evil; that the good are not to be worshipped, except in consequence of a precept of the highest God: proving in § 3 that evil spirits are adored by the Pagans, and showing how that is

Arabian Peninsula. The Sabæans exerted considerable power and influence in the region from the first century BC to the third century AD.

¹ The Laplanders, or Sámi people, inhabited the northern reaches of Sweden, Norway, Finland, and the Kola Peninsula of Russia. The Laplanders were polytheists. Christianity was introduced into the region by Roman Catholic missionaries, probably in the thirteenth century. However, the traditional paganism continued to be observed well into the time of the Reformation.

² Athenagoras (c. 133-190) was an Athenian philosopher. Converting to Christianity, he became an apologist for his newfound faith. Although he appears to have been influential in his day, only few of his writings have been preserved.

³ Tatian the Assyrian (c. 120-c. 180) was a Christian theologian and apologist. He is most remembered for his *Diatessaron*, his harmony of the four gospels, which was used in the Syriac church until the fifth century. In his *Oratio ad Græcos*, he extols the virtues and antiquity of Christianity, and critiques paganism. Some shadow has been cast over his name by accusations of heresy, by Irenæus and Eusebius.

⁴ Julius Firmicus Maternus (flourished in the first half of the fourth century) appears to have had a pagan, classical education. He published a work on astrology, *Matheseos libros octo* (c. 335). Later, perhaps after a conversion experience, he published a work assailing paganism, *De errore profanarum religionum* (c. 346).

⁵ Gerhard Johann Vossius (1577-1649) was a Dutch classical scholar and theologian. In 1619, his *Historia Pelagiana* brought him into suspicion of Arminianism.

unsuitable: speaking in § 4 against the Worship exhibited toward dead men in Paganism, in § 5 against the Worship exhibited toward the stars and elements, in § 6 against the Worship exhibited toward dumb animals, in § 7 against the Worship exhibited toward those things which are not substances: in § 8 he answers the Objection of the Pagans taken from the Miracles among them, and in § 9 from the Oracles: in § 10 he rejects the Religion of the Pagans because of this, that it failed of itself as soon as human helps were wanting: in § 11 he responds to this, that the rise and ruin of Religion is ascribed to the efficacy of the stars: in § 12 he shows that the principal things of the Christian Religion are proven by the sages of the pagans: if anything in this is difficult to believe, corresponding things are found among the pagans. STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter IX, § 1-36, clearly expounds *Gentilism* with respect to its principal errors, sets forth its occasion and causes, and refutes it with a few things. Concerning the Theology of the ancient Gentiles, consult also BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book I, chapter IV, § 30, tome I, pages 283b-288a, who also afterwards discourses concerning *Gentilism* and the method for converting the Gentiles, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1393b-1395b. Concerning the Gentile Theology of the contemporary Malabars,¹ see *Epistolas Danicas*, written in Dutch, *Epistle XI*, pages 250-255.

The Gentiles, particularly the Greeks and Romans, again were dividing Theology into the Fabulous Theology of the Poets, the Natural Theology of the Philosophers, and the Civil Theology of the Priests and People: concerning which division of Gentile Theology VOSSIUS treats in his *de Theologia Gentili*, book II, part I, chapter I, page 115, in which he observes that nothing is more useful or necessary to the understanding of all the worship of the nations, especially the Greek and Roman worship, than the distinguishing the threefold Theology of the nations, *fabulous*, which is drawn from the figments of the Poets, *natural*, from the mysteries of nature, and *civil*, which is sought out of the decrees of Legislators. That this division of Theology was received by Quintus Mucius Scævola, the son of Publius,² AUGUSTINE relates in his *de Civitate Dei*, book IV, chapter

¹ The Malabar Coast is the southwestern shoreline on the Indian subcontinent. The Dutch controlled the region from 1661 to 1795. The indigenous people were Hindus.

² Quintus Mucius Scævola (died 82 BC) was the son of Publius Mucius Scævola (consul in 133 BC, and Pontifex Maximus). Quintus was elected

XXVII, "It is related in records that the most learned Pontifex *Scævola* argued that three kinds of gods were delivered: one by the Poets, another by the Philosophers, a third by principal men of the state, etc." That the judgment of *Scævola* in this matter was followed by *Terentius Varro*,¹ in his first book of divine matters, notes AUGUSTINE in his *de Civitate Dei*, book VI, chapter V, where he relates these his words: "There are three kinds of Theology, and of these one is called mythical, another physical, a third civil. That they call mythical, of which the Poets especially make use; physical, of which the philosophers especially make use; civil, of which the people especially make use. As to the first which I have mentioned, in it are many fictions contrary to the dignity and nature of the immortals.... There is a second sort...concerning which the philosophers have left many books: in which one will find, the gods, who they are, where, of what sort, etc. Thus other things, which ears are more easily able to bear within the walls of a school, than outside in the forum. There is a third sort, which in cities the citizens, and especially the priests, ought to be acquainted with and to conduct: in which there is, what Gods one is publicly to worship, what sacred rites and sacrifices one is to perform. The first Theology is especially accommodated to the theater, the second to the world, the third to the city." This threefold sort of Theology EUSEBIUS also mentions in his *Præparatione Euangelica*, book IV, chapter I, page 130. Now, of this threefold Theology TERTULLIAN makes a salty mention in his *ad Nationes*, book II, chapter I, "Following your own commentaries, which ye have drawn out of every sort of Theology, following step-by-step, because the authority of books is greater with you in matters of this kind, than the authority of facts, I have chosen to abridge the works of *Varro*, who, having gathered out of all things previously digested concerning divine things, has shown himself a suitable guide for us. If I inquire of him, who were the insinulators of the gods? he asserts either the philosophers, the people, or the poets. For by a threefold distinction he has divided the registry of the gods: one being the physical, which the philosophers pour over; another being the mythical, which is constantly

tribune (106 BC), aedile (104 BC), consul (95 BC), and finally Pontifex Maximus. He authored a large treatise on civil law (*Jus civile primum constituit generatim in libros decem et octo redigendo*), which survives in only a few fragments.

¹ Marcus Terentius Varro, or Varro Reatinus (116-27 BC), was a scholar, called "the most learned of the Romans," producing seventy-four works on a variety of topics.

turned over by the poets; the third being the gentile, which the nations have adopted each one for itself. When, therefore, the philosophers have constructed physical theology out of their own conjectures, when the poets have drawn mythical theology from fables, when the nations have forged gentile theology according to their own will, where is truth to be gathered? In conjectures? but these are only a doubtful conception. In fables? but the relating of them is disgraceful. In adoptions? but the adoption is arbitrary and municipal. In the end, among the philosophers things are uncertain, because diverse; among the poets all things are unworthy, because shameful; among the nations all things are arbitrary, because voluntary. Divinity, moreover, if thou consider again the true, is of this character, that it is neither gathered from uncertain arguments, nor contaminated with worthless fables, nor determined by arbitrary adoptions. For it ought to be regarded, as it really is, as certain, entire, universal, because it is in truth the property of all. Furthermore, which god shall I believe? one whom conjecture has contemplated, whom history has mentioned, whom a community has preferred? I would much more justifiably believe in no god, than in one that is to be doubted, or is shameful, or is adopted." Those things are most worthy of reading, which, to demonstrate the falsehood and errors of this threefold Theology, were gathered by LELAND,¹ in his treatise concerning *The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation*, discussing Mythical Theology in *part I, section I, chapter VI, pages 195-207*; Civil Theology in *chapters VII-IX, pages 208-303*; the Natural Theology of the Philosophers in *part I, section II, chapters X and following*, and throughout the rest of the entire work.

Our AUTHOR, in addition, makes mention of the other Division of Gentile Theology, namely, the *Platonic* division, into *συμβολικὴν/symbolic* or *μυστικὴν/mystical*, and *φιλοσοφικὴν/philosophical* or *ἀποδεικτικὴν/demonstrative*. That is, Plato considered the Theology of his own people either as *συμβολικὴν/symbolic*, which was contained, hidden, in the veils of signs: for under these it was the custom of the ancient Gentiles, especially of the Egyptians, to teach divine mysteries: or as *φιλοσοφικὴν/philosophical* or *ἀποδεικτικὴν/demonstrative*, which through much meditation and a series of arguments was leading a man unto the knowledge of divine things. See PLATO'S

¹ John Leland (1691-1766) was an English Presbyterian minister. The focus of his authorship is the opposition of Deism.

Republic, book II; CLEMENT of Alexandria's *Stromatum*, book V.

Concerning the method of convincing and converting the *Gentiles* there is, as the most worthy to be read, HOORNBEECK'S *de Conversione Indorum et Gentilium*; so also STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemice*, tome 2, chapter IX, § 37 and *following*, discusses invalid methods and the best *method of converting Infidels and Unbelievers*: and in § 46 and *following*, he takes up, as especially opposed to himself, the *Anonymous Gaul*, who in a tractate entitled, *Lettres sur la Religion essentielle à l'homme distinguée de ce qui n'en est que l'accessoire*,¹ argues that for the conversion of Infidel man the Mysteries of the Christian faith are not to be discussed with him, neither the divinity of the Sacred Scripture; but only the practical precepts of the Gospel are to be instilled in him, which is not able to be done without the Infidel acknowledging saving truths. Against which hypothesis *Stapfer* observes: 1. While *Anonymous* thinks that knowledge of the Mysteries does not pertain to the essence of the Christian Religion, and that those, therefore, are to be left unsaid as unprofitable; he speaks contradictories: for the Christian Religion is chiefly distinguished from Natural Religion by the belief of the Revealed Mysteries, § 69-86. 2. The mysterious Dogmas are not merely theoretical, but as useful as possible for practice, neither are they thus to be eliminated from the number of Articles pertaining to the essence of Religion, § 87-91. 3. The new method with complete absurdity leaves it free to Unbelievers whether they will believe or not believe that the Sacred Scripture is of divine origin and inspiration, § 92-95. 4. *Anonymous* urges the necessity of the practical Articles in such a way that he wrongly supposes that they are able to be understood without an acquaintance with the Mysteries, § 96-99. 5. *Anonymous* wrongly thinks that what is necessary to know in the Mysteries is *obscure*, § 100-104. 6. *Anonymous*, describing *Faith* as an evident persuasion concerning the Existence of the Divine Nature and its attributes, gives to Faith a definition that is not at all similar to the scope/goal of Revelation, and converts Christianity into mere Naturalism, § 105-125. 7. In this new method those things are omitted that constitute the essence of Revealed Religion; no one becomes a Christian in this manner, but he learns to halt in mere Natural Religion, § 126. 8. Thus he has clearly departed from the method of Christ and the Apostles, § 127-133.

That True Religion is taught, not in any of the False Theologies

¹ The *Lettres* were composed by Marie Huber (1695-1753), a Swiss author, translator, and editor. She was a universalist.

of this section, but in the Theology of the Reformed, VAN AALST¹ takes as a thing to be demonstrated in his *Prefatione* before the explication of *Parabolæ de Satore*.

¹ Gerardus van Aalst (1678-1759) was a Dutch Reformed pastor.

§ 7: Archetypal Theology

Hastening on to *True Theology*, we observe that this, although with respect to the substance of the matter it be *One*, is able to be called manifold in relation to the *Subjects* to whom it is attributed. And thus indeed it is either *Archetypal*, or *Ectypal*.

Archetypal Theology is not simply to be described as *God's Knowledge concerning Himself*; but, if we wish to consider *the Infinite Theology of God* as a *τύπον/type* and *πρωτότυπον/prototypical exemplar*, according to which our *Theology* ought to be formed, it is to be added, *which He decreed to manifest to the creature*. And thus the *Theology of the Creatures* shall be a true *Ectype*, or the *Image of the Archetype* expressed in *Creatures*. It does not appear that this distinction is controverted very much: 1. for it is evident that God knows Himself most completely, and so no one is a more perfect *θεολόγον/theologian*, Matthew 11:27, neither in this particular is the Holy Spirit inferior to the Father or the Son, 1 Corinthians 2:10, 11. 2. It is no less certain that God has decreed to communicate some knowledge of Himself with *Creatures*, 1 Corinthians 2:7. 3. Neither will any of our *Theology* be able to be described as true, which does not correspond to that *Knowledge of God concerning Himself and divine things*, which *Knowledge* He decreed to be manifested to us in one way or another. 4. If the *Knowledge of God* also has regard to the *Image of God*, should not that *Knowledge* be called *Ectypal*, of which that *Knowledge of God in God* shall be the *archetypal exemplar*? yes, indeed, Colossians 3:10, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον (ἄνθρωπον), τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, *having put on the new (man), which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him*. 5. The *Sacred Scripture* is said to deliver to us *τύπον διδαχῆς, the form/type of doctrine*, Romans 6:17, ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων, *the pattern/prototype of sound words*, 2 Timothy 1:13; but this is that knowledge of divine things revealed to us by the decree of God, in accordance with which our subjective *Theology* ought to be formed: so that to this extent this division of *Theology* also agrees quite well *with the expression of Scripture*. 6. Finally, this distinction shall be useful for this, that a *Theologian* might piously learn how to engage in the meditation of divine things, and

thus from God to have an understanding in those things which have regard unto God, so that in his knowledge of God he might not deviate from that which of God and by God has been revealed to the creature.

The Most Illustrious REINERUS VOGELSANG, *Minster of the Word and Professor of Theology at Silva-Ducis*,¹ in his *Exercitationibus Theologicis*, *Exercitation I*, § 8, page 3, objects, “God is the fount of all wisdom and an inexhaustible spring: nevertheless, no one has yet been found to be such a hairsplitter, that he would obtrude a Logical, Ontological, Arithmetical, Physical, Astrological, Pneumatic knowledge, each as if a double knowledge, Archetypal and Ectypal.” Similarly what the Most Illustrious BRAUN² has in his *Doctrina Foederum*, *locus I*, *chapter I*, § 5, page 3. *Responses*: 1. A different rationale belongs to Theology and to the other disciplines which we have just mentioned: α. Theology, having God Himself as its *object*, in dignity far excels the remaining disciplines, and pertains to the *Image of God primarily*; the remaining disciplines only *secondarily*. β. God has not to such an extent delineated to us an express *type* of the other disciplines, as He has in the case of *Theology*, especially as it is revealed in His *Word*, unto which norm our Knowledge ought to be conformed. 2. Nevertheless, if anyone should wish to recognize a certain Archetypal Knowledge in God, and Ectypal in creatures, in the other arts and sciences also; it would be allowed by us, although in a less emphatic sense.

If you should object in addition, that the Infinite knowledge of the infinite God is not able to be expressed in Creatures, and so the division of Theology into Archetypal and Ectypal falls. *Responses*: Therefore we do not simply call *the Knowledge of God concerning Himself* Archetypal Theology; but, in a limited way, that which He decreed to reveal to the creature. 2. By equal right you would deny that man was able to be created according to the Image of God, because God’s infinite virtues of Wisdom and Holiness were not able to be expressed in a finite creature. Now, that expression requires a proportion of analogy and similitude, not necessarily of commensuration; although even the latter is able to be said to be present in Ectypal Theology, if you attend to the Decree of God concerning the revelation of the knowledge of Himself.

¹ Reinerus Vogelsang (1610-1679) was a Reformed divine, and Professor of Theology at Deventer (1676-1679). *Silva-Ducis* is the Latin name of ’s-Hertogenbosch, a city in the southern Netherlands.

² Johannes Braun (1628-1708) was a Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Groningen (1680-1708).

But also LIMBORCH among the Remonstrants¹ says, among other things, in his *Theologia Christiana*, book I, chapter I, § 2, page 1, that Theology is *viciously* divided into Archetypal and Ectypal, inasmuch as this *would be prejudicial to divine Freedom, and transmute God into one acting necessarily*. Responses: 1. Not at all, for Archetypal Theology embraces as much the free Knowledge of God, as the natural and necessary: as Ectypal Theology also contains in itself the Knowledge, not only of the divine persons and perfection; but also of those actions, which flow from the free counsel of divine grace. 2. But here perhaps a snake lurks in the grass: and the true reason why this division is not satisfactory to the Remonstrants perhaps shall be that, according to the Socinians and Remonstrants, Religion is summed up in Observance of commandments and Hope of promises; to which we add the Knowledge of things to be believed, and among other things the Knowledge of the Trinity also; which those either reject, or judge less necessary: but it is not able to be denied that Archetypal Theology includes this knowledge; to which if Ectypal Theology ought to correspond, the matter shall be concluded and the quarrel decided in our favor.

¹ Philip van Limborch (1633-1712) was a Dutch Remonstrant pastor and theologian, and Professor of Theology at Amsterdam (1667-1712).

§ 8: Ectypal Theology: Of Union

Ectypal Theology, according to the rationale of the Subjects, again will be threefold, of *Union*, of *Vision*, and of *the Race-course*: all are *finite*, but nevertheless one differs much from the others in the degree of perfection.

Theology of *Union* belongs to Christ *according to His human nature*, by virtue of the personal *Union* with the person of the Λόγου/*Logos*, whence it is called the *Theology of Union*. It is also called the Theology of *Unction*, on account of the *Unction* of the Spirit intervening here. But that *Union* mentioned agrees with Christ alone; while the *Unction* of the Spirit is common to the faithful with Himself, although it is applicable to Christ in a more excellent degree: it is established that the Theology of all the truly faithful is to a certain extent able to be called a Theology of *Unction*; and to that extent the appellation of *Theology of Union* is more emphatic and distinguishing, and less ambiguous. Concerning which there must be no error either in *excess*, or in *defect*.

An *error in excess* would obtain, if we should desire to establish this Theology as altogether *Infinite*, since human nature, which is always *finite*, is no more capable of infinite Spiritual Gifts, than of the infinite Attributes or properties of the divine nature: whence it is certain this Theology of the human nature of Christ is not the very Infinite Wisdom of God. This matter shall be disputed in more particulars in *Chapter XIX*, § 22, 24-26. And so Archetypal and Ectypal Theology come together simultaneously in Christ and come to be distinguished: the former agrees with Him as the Λόγῳ/*Logos*, the latter according to the human nature.

But on the other hand we would err in *defect*, unless we acknowledge that by virtue of the Union of the human nature of Christ with the person τοῦ Λόγου, *of the Logos*, His Theology by a great interval of excellence exceeds the Theology of any mere Creature. The Sacred Scripture goes before, when it teaches that the gifts of the Holy Spirit were conveyed to Him as bountifully as possible, and in a far more abundant measure than to any other; Sacred Scripture teaches this both in the Old Testament and in the New.

Thus we read in the Old Testament, Psalm 45:7: עֲלֵינוּ מִן־שָׁמַיִם

:מִחְבֵּרֶיךָ שָׁמֹן אֶלֶיְהִיךָ שְׁמֹן אֱלֹהִים, *therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows*. The Psalmist here address the Son of God as the incarnate and exalted Mediator, the King and Bridegroom of the Church, by the name *Elohim*; and he affirms that He was anointed unto this reward of His most ample obedience and untainted holiness demonstrated in His life and death, that is, anointed at the time of His exaltation and sitting at the right hand of God, by God the Father with the oil of gladness above His fellows. Once and again in his earthly life and death the Mediator was anointed by men with physical oil; see Luke 7:37, 38; John 12:3; 19:39, 40. But, when He is here said to be *anointed by the Father* with the oil of gladness as a reward for His obedience offered, the Prophet prophesies, 1. that the Messiah *is to be* solemnly *established* by God the Father *as the King of the Church*, and to be set at His right hand in glorious state of Authority: with the expression borrowed from the ancient Anointing of Kings. 2. That the Messiah is also, after the labors and most grievous sorrow of His own soul, to be translated unto a state of most blessed *Joy*.¹ 3. That to Him the *gifts of the Spirit* are *to be conferred* by the Father, whereby the Anointing, now granted to Him in this world, might obtain fulfillment, as Peter says that He is *anointed with the Holy Spirit and power*, Acts 10:38. Now, the apex of the *Excellence* of this Anointing is signified, when the Messiah is said to be anointed *above His Fellows*, מִחְבֵּרֶיךָ. It is asked, who then comes to be understood here as the *Fellows of Messiah*?

1. There are those devoted to the hypothesis, that explain this passage concerning *those called Gods*, whom formerly God and Christ considered as associates of the kingdom under the Old Testament, when it was not the *mere/pure kingdom* of God; but to whom a place under the New Testament is no longer able to be conceded, since now the *kingdom* of God has been made *pure*: see COCCEIUS' *Commentarium in locum, opera, tome 2, page 152a*. But briefly I would wish to be observed: 1. That all power of creatures with respect to the Church formerly was truly and merely ministerial and subordinate to Christ. 2. That today that ministerial power either in the republic or in the Church is not less, indeed in certain things it is greater. 3. That neither Angels, nor Elders, nor Priests as individuals were ever sharers of the external Anointing.

2. Rather, according to the *Dutch Annotations* and other great Theologians, by the *Fellows of Christ* are understood all the faithful most

¹ See also Isaiah 53.

compactly joined to Christ and partaking of His spiritual Anointing mentioned here, equally as of His kingdom and other gifts. Unless it should please to restrict the phrase to the special ministers of Christ, and the paranympths of Him, τοὺς φίλους τοῦ νυμφίου, *the friends of the bridegroom*, John 3:29, as the one Bridegroom of the Church, which ministers, as paranympths are want to be richly adorned, also are furnished with gifts above the other faithful and are eminent in rewards; yet in such a way that Christ also greatly excels these, by a comparison with John 3:31, which would not be discordant with the genius of this Epithalamium.¹ Certainly in both these ways, 1. the same sort of Anointing and Oil is observed in Christ and His Fellows: 2. and the Fellows with the Anointing of Christ are referred unto the same time also; yet not with the faithful of the other age and the Ministers of the Church excluded. But, against that exegesis concerning the faithful Members of Christ, the Most Illustrious WESSELIUS, in his *Dissertationibus Academicis*, *Dissertation VIII*, observes, that, since the *faithful* are the *subjects* of this true King, and are here contemplated as His wife and *sharer of His bed*; and since the scope of the Psalmist in this Epithalamium is to commend the Royal Bridegroom to the Bride, as the unique object of faith in the case of salvation, and of the highest obedience: it is more agreeable to the rationale of the Epithalamium that the excellence of the King be proclaimed, not above His own faithful subjects, nor above the Bride herself; but above certain *other men*, having some other relation, not this closest, to this King, and to whom some faith, honor, and obedience is rendered by mortals: so that thus the Bride is admonished of her duty, that she always honor this King alone with respect and the highest and absolute obedience. But these, because Messiah in this Epithalamium is expressly set forth as *King*, themselves are not Anointed, all the Ancients in general, Prophets, Priests, and Kings, or even the Ministers of the New Testament.

3. But in particular all worldly *Kings*: whom Doctor Ainsworth,² by a comparison with Psalm 89:27, had taught to be able to be understood here also. 1. That in a similar manner Christ is frequently

¹ That is, *Wedding Song*.

² Henry Ainsworth (1571-1622) was an English Nonconformist, Separatist, and early Congregationalist. Ainsworth served a group of English Nonconformists in Amsterdam; he held the office of Doctor. He was one of the great Hebraists of his age, and his annotations upon the Pentateuch, Psalms, and the Song of Solomon demonstrate his command of the Hebrew language and Rabbinical learning and lore.

proclaimed as the most excellent King above all earthly powers, notes the Most Illustrious *Wesselius*, Revelation 19:16; Ephesians 1:21, 22. 2. He adds that the name of *the Anointed*, posited absolutely, is given to Kings *par excellence*. 3. The gifts of the Spirit, at least the heroic ones, were wont to be granted chiefly to *Anointed Kings* in Israel; so that *Saul*, having been *Anointed*, through those gifts *was changed into another man*; and *the Spirit* of Jehovah *came upon David*, soon after he had been anointed by Samuel, 1 Samuel 10; 16. Now, thus the Anointing of Messiah above His Fellows shall denote, α. the Excellency of His Kingdom, β. the Excellency of His Happiness and Joy, γ. the Excellency of the Anointing and Oil poured forth, or of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit communicated, in kind, measure, duration, etc.

And thus to that Most Illustrious Man reasons are not wanting, which he would set over against the opinion of the others, and by which he would fortify his own. With diligence the Reader will be able to examine these opinions varying among themselves, and to judge in the fear of the Lord which one best satisfies the scope of the Holy Spirit.

The other text that our AUTHOR cites is from the New Testament, John 3:34, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα, *for God giveth not the Spirit by measure*. While the Spirit is said to have been given οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, *not by measure*, not indeed infinite things, which do not at all admit of measure, but the altogether superabounding gifts of the Spirit are understood, bestowed upon the humanity of Christ: whether *John* means that the same are not given according to the measure of other men, to whom as individuals God ἐμέρισε μέτρον, *divided a measure*, Romans 12:3: or that with such a large hand are they given, that no measure is used, as it is wont to be done by those giving sparingly, of which matter an example is given in the case of Ezekiel, receiving food and drink by measure, Ezekiel 4:10, 11: or that the same are given so copiously that no man, not even of those greatly illuminated, attains that greatest measure; just as neither *the heavens above are able to be measured, nor the foundations of the earth beneath to be searched out*, Jeremiah 31:37 compared with Isaiah 40:12. And, that thus to Christ, sent by God, speaking the words of God, beloved by the Father, all the while He was dwelling upon this earth, the Spirit was given most copiously, *John* affirms, above all others that have been made partakers of the Spirit, if we attend to the ἔμφασιν/*emphasis* of the expression now explained. I know that in the words cited from *John* Christ is not mentioned, whether by name expressed, or by a relative

pronoun; and that the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS, in his *Commentario ad locum*, § 97, *opera*, tome 4, page 127a, denies that these words, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα, *for God giveth not the Spirit by measure*, are to be taken elliptically, as if the pronoun, *to Him*, were omitted; who thinks that the same are to be explained of the abundance of the Spirit and of Grace, which comes to the entire Church of the New Testament. But, 1. an ellipsis here is altogether necessary, since the donation of the Spirit ought to be terminated upon a certain person or society, and to that extent Cocceius holds it to be necessary to understand the *Church*. But it is now certainly preferable to supply the ellipsis by a relative or demonstrative pronoun, than by a new noun not at all found in the context. 2. Concerning the faithful of the New Testament the Scripture everywhere testifies that they receive the Spirit κατὰ μέτρον, according to a certain measure, Romans 12:3, 6; 1 Corinthians 12:4, 11; Ephesians 4:7:¹ and to that extent, although it is able to bear an agreeable sense, yet it is not altogether suited to the expression of Scripture, to say of the faithful of the New Testament that they have the Spirit οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, *not by measure*. 3. Christ is treated in the most recent context, from *verse 28* unto these words; *John* next speaks of Christ again in *verse 35*: these few intermediate words, therefore, do not appear to be referred to another subject; by which words *John* most validly proves that He, *whom God sent*, speaks *God's pure words*, received from and commanded by God, because God gives the Spirit to Him οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, not according to a certain measure, as to the other Prophets. But the argument will be convoluted and obscure, if from the large effusion of the Spirit, about to follow only after *John* and Christ Himself, it will be proven that Messiah came, and that Jesus is He above other contemporaries. Now, it is a familiar Canon of GLASSIUS: "The relative pronoun, *qui, quæ, quod, who, what, which*, and likewise *ille, ipse, that man, he himself*, is not rarely wanting, both in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and in the Greek text of the New." *Grammaticorum Sacrorum tractatu* II, canon 22, pages 211, 212, where, besides other examples, for example, Matthew 21:7, ἐπεκάθισαν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν, *they set upon them*, that is, *Him*; Acts 13:3, ἀπέλυσαν, *they sent away*, that is, *them*; 1 Corinthians 10:9, καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, *as also some of them tempted*, namely, *Him*: *John 3:34* is cited

¹ Ephesians 4:7: "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure (κατὰ τὸ μέτρον) of the gift of Christ."

also in this text. In the same manner the Most Illustrious PASOR, in his *Grammatica Græca sacra Novi Testamenti*, page 273, takes the matter.

§ 9: Ectypal Theology: Of Vision

The *Theology of Vision* is also called the *Theology of the Fatherland* (*Theologia Patriæ*), from the place where it obtains, in the highest Heaven, which is not only τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, *the proper habitation*, of Angels, Jude 6, but also the true Native Land of the pious and faithful, whose τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, *citizenship/commonwealth is in heaven*, Philippians 3:20, who confess ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *that they are strangers and pilgrims on the earth*; and thus show ὅτι πατρίδα κρείττονα, τοῦτέστιν ἐπουρανίον, ἐπιζητοῦσι, *that they seek a better country, that is, an heavenly*, Hebrews 11:13-16. It is called *of Vision* from the degree of perfection, and from that altogether clear manner of cognition.

This is attributed to the *Angels* of heaven, concerning whom the Lord bears witness in Matthew 18:10, οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανοῖς διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσι τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, *the angels in heaven always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven*, that is, dwelling in the closest communion with God, they constantly observe His nod; and hence they penetrate unto a most intimate knowledge of divine things also; which *experimental* knowledge brings the *natural* and eminent knowledge of Angels to a greater state of perfection from day to day (compare *Chapter IX*, § 8): whence it is said once and again unto David, to signify his rare Wisdom, *my Lord the King is after the likeness of an Angel of God*, 2 Samuel 14:17; 19:27. They are not unlike the servants of King Solomon, whom the Queen of Sheba proclaimed blessed, since they, standing continually before the face of the King, were hearing his Wisdom, 1 Kings 10:8.

Second, the *Theology of Vision* is attributed to the *other blessed Inhabitants of Heaven*, to whom *the Vision of God* has been promised, Matthew 5:8; Hebrews 12:14, and who await the same in faith, Psalm 17:15.

Now, the expression, when we speak of the *Theology of Vision*, and we hear mention made concerning the *Vision of God in the passages cited*, is transferred from corporeal Vision and sense unto spiritual Vision and *Knowledge of Intellect*, with which the most joyful *Fruition* will be joined. Inasmuch as we are not able to see with the eyes of the Body the

Triune God, who is a Spirit.

Moreover, in the blessed after the Resurrection of the Body there shall also be a Vision of the Son of God Incarnate, in His human nature assumed and now for some time glorified, with the eyes of their bodies; concerning whom *John* speaks the words in 1 John 3:2, and whom already formerly Holy *Job* was awaiting, Job 19:26, 27. With respect to the present life *Job* had entirely cast away all hope of restoration; compare Job 6:11; 7:5, 7, 8, 15, 16; 16:16; 17:1, 14, 15; 19:10. But after death he was certain that he was going to see God, at the time when after his skin they had some time ago pierced this very thing,¹ and his Redeemer in the end would stand upon the earth.² To explain this Vision of the spiritual Knowledge and Fruition of God immediately after death with respect to the soul, is prevented by, 1. the mention, quite distinct and repeated more than once, of *vision* and *sight*: 2. the added limitation and declaration of this Vision, not only *from my flesh*, but also *my eyes*: 3. the postponement of this Sight, even until his Redeemer should stand upon the earth, and the remains of his Body with the skin should be consumed; of which Body even now so very wretched indeed, and further to be dissolved to dust after death, with these words *Job* with sufficient clarity promises to himself a restoration unto wholeness through the power of his Redeemer. Neither ought it to trouble anyone that, when *Job* has twice said וְרָאֵה, *I shall see*, in the future, it follows in the third place וְרָאִיתִי, *and my eyes have beheld*, in the past; as if this last should be referred to the *Vision of faith*, which had already come to *Job*, and which was to him ὑπόστασις τῶν ἐλπίζομένων, *the support of those hoping*. For, although the matter be altogether true, yet the close tie of these words with the rest, the express mention of *eyes* added, and the emphasis of the adjunct, וְלֹא־אֲנִי, *and not another*, require that this expression also be explained of corporeal Vision. The *past* here, therefore, shall be set down through an enallage of the past for the future, by which the expectation of this future

¹ A literal rendering of Job 19:26a: “And after my skin they destroy this (וְאַחֲרָיִם וְקַפְּיִי נִקְפְּאוּ)...”

² Job 19:25.

event is at the same time declared to be most certain; otherwise the verbs in the future shall be left to be explained: just as frequently a preterite, following after a future, has the significance of the future; see Job 5:16,¹ 19, 20.²

And, as these things shall be spoken of the *sight of Vision* in the Theology of the Fatherland; so the Apostle indicates its *degree* and *manner*, by far the most complete and clear, when he not only opposes this *Vision*, διὰ εἶδους περιπατεῖν, *of walking by sight*, to walking by faith, 2 Corinthians 5:7, but expressly pronounces that at that time τὸ τέλειον, *the perfect*, shall be come, 1 Corinthians 13:9, 10. Indeed, so that he might depict before our eyes the exceedingly great distance, which is between the Knowledge of this and of the future life, he adds *verse* 12, βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον· ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην, *for now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known*. And so the distance between the Knowledge of this and of the future life is as great as between a sight of the very thing or person being present and of a representation of some thing exhibited in a glass. So much shall the understanding of divine things hereafter be clearer than the knowledge of this life, as we are wont to comprehend a more certain and complete knowledge of a thing from the thing set forth in proper words, than under the wraps of enigmas.

¹ Job 5:16: “So there is (יְהִי, in the imperfect/future) to the poor hope, and iniquity stoppeth (תִּצְרֹף, in the perfect) her mouth.”

² Job 5:19, 20: “He shall deliver thee (יִצִּיל, in the imperfect/future) in six troubles: yea, in seven there shall no evil touch (עָלָה, in the imperfect/future) thee. In famine he shall redeem thee (יִרְצֶה, in the perfect) from death: and in war from the power of the sword.”

§ 10: Ectypal Theology: Of the Race-course

Theology that agrees with men dwelling in this world,

1. is called *of the Race-course* (*Theologia Stadii*) from the state of the subjects, for it has its place in men that, as it were, run in the *Race-course* of this world and of the militant Church, having not yet reached the goal, according to the teaching of the Apostle, Hebrews 12:1, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχουμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα, *with patience let us run the race that is set before us*; 1 Corinthians 9:24, *know ye not ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἷς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον; οὕτω τρέχετε, ἵνα καταλάβητε, that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run that ye may obtain.* For the same reason it is called the *Theology of Pilgrims* (*Theologia Viatorum*), as opposed to the *Theology of the Fatherland* (*Theologia Patriæ*), for it belongs to those that pass their time in the Way and make a journey to the heavenly fatherland; just as the Lord made mention of Ways narrow and broad, leading to life or destruction, Matthew 7:13, 14. And those things which *Solomon* has concerning the *path of the righteous* and the way leading to life on high are well-known.¹

2. is also called *of the Race-course* from the manner and ordinary means of seeking, increasing, and preserving this Theology. For whoever applies himself to this Theology ought always to have the admonition of the Apostle set before himself, τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροῖ· τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, *not slothful in business; fervent in spirit*, Romans 12:11, and not to hesitate σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενεγκεῖν, *to give all diligence*, in accordance with 2 Peter 1:5, on which place see my *Commentarium*.

The same is also called the *Theology of Revelation* by TURRETIN in his *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus I, question II, § 7, 8, and by HEINRICH ALTING in his *Theologia didactica*, locus I, *Scriptorum Heidelbergensium*, tome I, page 1: whether the denomination be sought from the principal part, which is *Revealed Theology*; or *Revelation*, ἀποκάλυψις, properly the Manifestation of a matter previously hidden,

¹ For example, Proverbs 2:20; 4:11; 5:6.

Romans 16:25; Revelation 1:1, be taken more broadly from each and every manifestation, φανερώσει, which also squares with natural Theology, Romans 1:19.¹ It is better to say, according to MARESIUS, in his *Systemate Theologico*, locus I, § 5, note a, that the *Manifestation* of God is *Natural* and *Revealed*; than that we again divide *Revelation* thereupon into *natural* and *special*.

This Theology of the *Race-course* is always *Imperfect*, 1 Corinthians 13:9, 10.

Yet, in the case of the Believing, a *Perfection of Sufficiency for salvation ought to be attributed to that*: for through it they learn all things necessary for salvation, 1 John 2:20. The *Sacred Scripture* makes them wise unto salvation, and through its manifold uses it causes the *man of God* to attain unto *perfection*, 2 Timothy 3:15-17.

Our AUTHOR observes that the *Scholastics* intend to signify this, when they attribute *Comprehension* to Christ as Pilgrim and to the Blessed. But this expression of the *Papists*, by which they simultaneously call Christ *Pilgrim* and *Comprehensor*, our AUTHOR shall note with censure in *Chapter XIX*, § 22. But, as far as the *heavenly Blessed* are concerned, neither is an *adequate Comprehension* of God and of divine things able to be attributed to them, as opposed to an *Apprehensive* knowledge, in which we rejoice in this world. Evidently this expression, obtained from corporeal matters, has been transferred to the intellect. For, as the hand touches Bodies smaller than itself, in such a way that, surrounding and exceeding in every part, it encompasses them entirely; but it holds Bodies greater than itself in some part, yet in such a way that in another portion it is exceeded by them: so also our Intellect is said to *comprehend* a matter that it knows fully and completely by an idea adequate to the very object, and penetrating within all and everything predicated of it; as often as the intellect falls short of this fullness of knowledge, representing to itself, not all things as they are in themselves, but only certain attributes of a thing, and in whatever sort of manner, just so often it is said only to *apprehend* a thing; if I might thus make the words of the Most Illustrious VRIESIUS, which are found in his *Exercitationibus rationalibus* XIV, § 2, my own. But now all the knowledge of Creatures that we have concerning God is of the latter sort of Knowledge. For it is of the nature of the finite that there is absolutely no proportion between it and the infinite, neither is the former able to

¹ Romans 1:19: "Because that which may be known of God is manifest (φανερόν) in them; for God hath shewed (ἐφανερώσε) it unto them."

be equal to the latter. And so, while on the one hand the perfections cognizable in God are infinite in every way, but on the other hand the cognizing ability in every creature is finite; certainly those perfections will leave behind them by the greatest distance whatever cogitations of the creature, neither will they be understood fully and perfectly even by the comprehension of all creatures together. To such an extent God is truly Incomprehensible to every created mind. But also such remains for the Spirits of the Blessed: seeing that Blessedness shall not grant to a finite mind infinity; nor restrict the infinite God within the bounds of finitude. And so the blessed are able to be called *Comprehensors* only in a certain sense, with limitation and comparatively; 1. inasmuch as then they shall obtain that which now they strenuously follow, Philippians 3:12-14; 2. inasmuch as the knowledge of the Blessed with respect to Perfection much exceeds that which here always obtains, and fills every capacity of the subject, even if it does not exhaust all the fullness of the object. Then τὸ τέλειον, *the perfect*, will have come, says Paul, 1 Corinthians 13:10. But, perfectly and fully knowing whatever shall be to be known of blessedness by us, in this way we shall be able to be said to rejoice in a *Comprehensive Theology*.

§ 11: The Existence of Theology of the Race-Course

Our AUTHOR, in § 11, proves that a Theology of the Race-course *is given*. In support of this are alleged ratiocinations *à priori*, 1. from the *Goodness of God*, which, since it is the Best, is most Communicative of itself; but is not able to communicate itself more appropriately to a rational creature than by its own knowledge and love. 2. *From the End of God in the Creation and Preservation of things*, who as a spirit and consummate reason undoubtedly proposes to Himself some end in working; but because of His Independence He ought to propose to Himself an ultimate end, not outside of Himself, but in Himself, that is, His own glorification. However, it is never possible to obtain this end of the recognition and celebration of Himself apart from some Theology. 3. *From the Desire of Felicity innate in man*; which sort of desire is not able to be denied by experience, which at the same time teaches that the mind is able to rest entirely in the fruition of no good, except in the communion of God Himself, the highest good: but apart from Theology no one is able to obtain this. Therefore, if Theology be not given, this Desire of Felicity innate in man would be in vain: and, since he finds that nothing is blessed in every respect, and that all things also are in flux and tottering, neither do they make for the satisfaction of his appetite; this Desire of Felicity would render man more miserable. But God and nature do nothing in vain: compare REIMARUS'¹ *over de voornaamste Waarheden van den natuurlichen Godtsdienst*, Essay 10, § 4-9, pages 677-695. 4. *From the Dependence of man*, which bids him to ascend unto the first Independent Being, to which it agrees to prescribe to a creature rational, and hence also dependent morally, a Law as the norm of all actions; and which, both because of the infinite excellence of its nature, and because of the absolute dependence of creatures upon It, is worthy to be honored with such esteem and veneration as is able to accrue to a finite soul. 5. *From the misery of man*, which he feels himself

¹ Hermann Samuel Reimar (1694-1768) was a German Enlightenment philosopher and Deist. He was an advocate for a pure, natural religion, as opposed to revealed religion; and he stimulated some of the investigation into the historical Jesus.

unequal to bear, neither is he able to look for sufficient help from any creature; which teaches him to flee to τὸν μακάριον καὶ μόνον δυναστὴν, *the blessed and only Potentate*.¹

But the same truth is sufficiently confirmed *à posteriori* by universal *Experience* among men, and the *Consensus* of all *peoples* admitting some Theology, although often quite corrupt. Although these have naturally strayed in a disgraceful manner from true Theology, yet they have attested that such a Theology is given by their pursuit of the same: but a disposition innate in all to acknowledge and worship the true God is not able to be vain. But to this universal Consent of all unto this truth, CICERO gave clear testimony once and again (that I might pass by others), in his *De Legibus*, book I, chapter VIII, “And so from such a large number of species there is no animal besides man that has any knowledge of God: and among these men there is no race so savage or wild, that it does not, even if it be ignorant what sort of God it be fitting to have, know that God is to be had.” Likewise also in his *de Natura Deorum*, book II, chapter V, “And so among all of all nations the opinion stands firm; for it is innate in all and, as it were, engraved in the soul, that there are Gods. Of what sort they might be, there is a variety of opinions: no one denies that they are.” And also in his *Tusculanis Questionibus*, book I, chapter XIII, “Moreover, as this appears to be alleged as a thing most firm, as to why we believe there to be Gods, that there is no race so wild, not one of all so inhuman, that the belief of the Gods has not permeated its mind. Many think perverse things concerning the Gods. For that is wont to be brought to pass by vicious custom. Yet all believe there to be a divine power and nature. But neither does the conference or consensus of men bring that to pass: the belief is not established by institutes, neither by laws. But in every matter the consent of all nations is to be regarded as the law of nature.” And, that thus this universal consent is to be regarded as a note of truth was everywhere believed of old: for thus SENECA² in his *Epistulis* CXVII, “We ought to grant much to the presumption of all men. Among us it is an argument of truth, that something appears so to all: as, that there are Gods, we thus gather, among other things, which is the innate belief of all concerning the Gods: neither is there a nation anywhere so cast beyond laws and customs, that it does not believe in some Gods.” Neither should anyone take

¹ 1 Timothy 6:15.

² Lucius Annæus Seneca (c. 4 BC-65 AD) was a Roman philosopher and dramatist.

exception that he might weaken the force of this argument from universal Consent, *that the peoples also consent in those things which sin suggests to them.* Responses: 1. That consent in sinning is practical, not theoretical, as this is concerning the acknowledging and worshipping of Divinity. 2. Men consent in doing ill in such a way that they also consent in condemning and disapproving those things that are done in an evil manner; for frequently that saying obtains: *I see and approve better things; I follow worse things.*¹ Compare to this argument BUDDEUS, in his *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, and JOHANNES LULOFS,² in his *Annotationibus ad eum caput V*, § 1, page 227-230, 232-235 (155-157).

Nevertheless, the *Atheist* denies that *True Theology* is given, tracing the origin of all Theology from the *vain Tradition* of parents or *Political Cunning*, playing to the *Credulity* and *superstitious Fear of men*. Of old the impious have thus been trifling: *What?* you read in CICERO'S *de Natura Deorum*, book I, chapter XLII, *those that said that the entire belief concerning the immortal Gods was contrived by wise men for this reason, that those that reason is not able to lead, religion might lead to duty, have they not utterly destroyed all religion?* The Epicureans were ascribing to *superstitious fear* all the received worship of Divinity.³ Indeed, according to PETRONIUS,⁴ in his *Satyricon*, page 207, and LUCRETIUS,⁵ in his *de Rerum Natura*, in the *beginning of book III*, page 289, *fear first made the Gods in the world.* Indeed,

...(Epicurus) *the glory of the Greek race,*
...inventor of things,...
...as soon as he began to vociferate with reason,
That the nature of things did not spring from a divine mind:
The terrors of soul dispersed: ...Not any
Thing strips away the peace of the soul at any time.

¹ Ovid's *Metamorphoses* VII, 20.

² Johannes Lulofs (1711-1768) was a Dutch astronomer, mathematician, and physicist.

³ The Epicureans were atomic materialists, denying divine intervention in the material realm.

⁴ Gaius Petronius Arbiter (c. 27-66 AD) was a Roman courtier, and fashion adviser to Nero. Although there is some doubt about the authorship of *Satyricon*, a medieval manuscript attributes it to one *Titus Petronius*.

⁵ Titus Lucretius Carus (c. 99-c. 55 BC) was a Roman poet and Epicurean philosopher.

Compare STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemiciæ*, tome 2, chapter VI, § 18, 19, 219, who to this Objection, as if the notion of God and all Theology and Religion was a figment of fevered men the better to secure unmanageable commoners in their duty, goes against many, *Theologicæ polemiciæ*, tome 2, chapter VI, § 220-265. Thomas Hobbes fetched the seeds and principia of Religion from these four causes; from *fear* ignorant of invisible spirits, which he denies to exist; from *ignorance* of second causes; from an unhealthy *worship* of those things which we imprudently fear; from an interpretation of *fortuitous* accidents, as having something divine and προγνωστικὸν/*prognostic*, *Leviathan*, chapter XII, page 57; against whom concerning this matter, and what things more he profanely blurts out concerning Religion out of the thought of Machiavelli,¹ COCQUIUS disputes in his *Hobbesianismi Anatome*, locus 1, chapter 11, pages 11-14. Elsewhere Hobbes contends that the existence of God is not able to be known by most men, as no one of the common people was able to discover (what Archimedes² discovered) what proportion a sphere has to a cylinder: and so, even if it could be known to some by the light of reason that God exists; yet men, continually occupied in seeking pleasures, or riches, or honors; likewise men that are not wont, or are not capable, or do not take care, to reason rightly, that is, that are foolish, in which number are the Atheists, are not able to know it: to which things compare COCQUIUS' *Hobbesianismi Anatomen*, locus VI, chapter XII, pages 103-109. Just how man, by his nature considered absolutely, morally independent from God, and God from man, is compelled by the *superior and irresistible power of God* unto such Worship of Him, according to Hobbes, the Most Illustrious VAN DE WYNPERSSE,³ in his *Dissertatione de Libertinismo*, pages 30-32, shows in more particulars. Concerning that absurd and impious System of Hobbes see also LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, chapter 3, pages 61-73.

But, 1. The absolutely universal extension of this Consensus

¹ Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli (1469-1527) was an Italian humanist, historian, and political philosopher. He believed Religion to be man-made, useful for the ordering of society, but dispensable if required for security.

² Archimedes of Syracuse (c. 287-c. 212 BC) was a Greek mathematician and engineer. He esteemed his proof that a sphere has two thirds of the volume and surface area of a cylinder as his greatest mathematical achievement.

³ Dionysius van de Wypersse (1724-1808) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Philosopher, Professor of Logic, Physics, and Metaphysics at Groningen (1752-1769).

upon Theology is objected: but to that extent neither the tradition of parents, nor the authority of Rulers, is ever able to be conceived of as efficacious, to excite in the souls of all a universal Consensus of this sort, which as immutably implanted in the same remains fixed. 2. It is one thing for parents to go before their children in false worship of Deity, with these footsteps of the ancestors treading on without reluctance; when they are evidently of their own accord inclined by nature to Theology: it is another thing to stir up this inclination in them for the first time, with no Deity existing in the nature of things, with the reverence of which we might be touched of our own accord. Likewise, it is one thing to make use of Religion and the sense of the Divine to compel people to obey and to secure them in duty: but it is another thing to impose for the first time such a persuasion of the Divine, although false, on people. The former is able to obtain, and has often obtained; but this very thing confirms that Theology has truly been given, because it supposes and reveals the spontaneous inclination of man unto the acknowledgement and worship of the Divine. 3. Otherwise a twofold disposition in depraved man would oppose this obedience to the Traditions of the ancestors, and the success of the Deceits of Politicians; namely, *Pride*, by which man most avidly desires to be the supreme lord of himself and his own actions; and the natural *Fear* of Deity, by which he does not feel all things to be lawful to him, which things are indeed pleasing: and hence, unless the natural dictate of the Heart hinder, man would be prone to cast away all sense and reverence of the Divine: certainly that creature of glory would not easily suffer itself to be induced to prostrate itself before the most lowly animals and productions of the earth: see TRIGLAND'S¹ *Orationem de Utilitate Religionis in Republica*, after the *Syllogem Dissertationum*, pages 54-56; CALVIN'S *Institutiones Christianæ Religionis*, book I, chapter III, where you read, "And furthermore idolatry is an ample demonstration of this idea. For we know how unwillingly man casts himself down, that he might admire other creatures above himself. Hence, since he prefers rather to worship wood and stone than to be thought to have no God, it is evident that that impression of deity is very powerful, which is so difficult to obliterate from the mind of man that it would be easier for the disposition of his nature to be broken: as it is certainly broken, when man willingly descends from that natural inflation to whatever

¹ Jacobus Trigland the Younger (1652-1705) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian. Beginning in 1686, he served as Professor of Theology at Leiden.

infirmities, that he might revere God.” 4. Although political Cunning is to be acknowledged in established Paganism and Mohammadanism, it is impossible for true Christianity to owe its origin to the deceits of Politicians: for nothing is more adverse to the pride of impious Politicians, desiring to govern all things according to their pleasure, than that precept in Acts 5:29, Πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις, *we ought to obey God rather than men*, and in Luke 12:4, 5, λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, Μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχόντων περισσώτερόν τι ποιῆσαι. Ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε, *And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do: But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear Him, which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him.* Indeed, unless this Religion came from God Himself, truly Existing, it would have been exterminated a long time ago by the power of Politicians, frequently persecuting and being eager to annihilate Christians: which is the pious observation, suited to our use, of the Eminent NIEUWENTYT,¹ *Cosmotheoria*, chapter XXI, § 43, pages 490, 491. 5. The opinion of Hobbes, insofar as he traces the Worship and veneration of God from the fear of a superior Power only, is exceedingly injurious to God, inasmuch as he, depriving Him of the natural right of requiring worship, and actually turning it into Tyranny, also destroys the true character of Religion, which men, only when compelled by force and fear, will observe; indeed which they will easily abjure again, thinking that God according to His own right is able to punish even His pious worshippers, indeed actually to dispense evils to good men: see VAN DE WYNPERSSE, in his *Dissertatione de Libertinismo*, pages 32-35. 6. While it is a well-worn saying of the Atheists that *Fear made God*, this saying is rather to be converted and expressed, *in the souls of profane men Fear makes a non-God*; while the Fear of a just Deity deserves to be held as the proximate cause of *Atheism* or *Scepticism*; see STAPFER’S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter VI, § 36-41; likewise of *Deism*, which indeed does not altogether deny the existence of Deity, but the providence of the same, the dependence of man upon God, and hence dismisses all Religion, both natural and

¹ Bernard Nieuwentyt (1654-1718) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and Cartesian philosopher.

revealed: see STAPFER, in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter VII, § 13-21, who asserts the same concerning *Epicureanism*, chapter VIII, § 10-12. And when Epicurus says that *fear first made the Gods in the world*, one may reply to him, And who made Fear? Does it not prove God and His existence? This of Epicurus himself and of other Atheists is shown by example from an *Anonymous author* in *Dissertatione pro Legato Stolpiano*, on the question *de pretio Consensus communis generis humani pro adferenda Numinis Existentia*, pages 159-162.

Against the *Atheists*, willing that the opinion concerning the Existence and Worship of God be referred among errors and prejudiced opinion, see also those disputing, for example, BUDDEUS, in his *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, and LULOFS, in his *Annotationibus ad eum caput VI*, § 9, page 378-385.

§ 12: Natural Theology: Innate

But it is helpful to divide the *Theology of the Race-Course* into *Natural* and *Revealed*, and then to give the Truth of each proven particularly.

It is thus evident that the Theology of the Race-Course is wont to be distinguished according to the diverse *Principium* from which it is drawn, either general, which is the whole Nature and Universe of things; or special, which is the Revealed Word of God, first ἄγραφον/*unwritten*, then ἔγγραφον/*written*. Nature in turn supplies a twofold *Book*, both of one's own *Heart*, then of *other Creatures*, outside of man or near him.

Natural Theology, which is sought from the book of one's own heart (although thence also Acquired Theology is able to be established), is called in the first place and specially *Engrafted* or *Innate*, even *Subjective*, for it is not drawn from the contemplation of objects many and outside of the man, but is inherent in the knowing subject. It is also called *Noëtic*, because it is had without discursive reasoning. Yet I would not have these things thus to be taken, as if natural Theology *in act* is in man from the womb, as the acts and ἐνέργεια/*operation* of life are immediately present in the living, and the senses are immediately present in the sensing; so that, for instance, this proposition, *God Exists*, as far as the actual conception and belief of it, from the first moment of birth is inherent in the soul of the infant. For an understanding of such an idea in the first state after the womb is hardly judged to be possible. It does not satisfy, on the other hand, if this innate Theology we should call *mere potency* or the faculty of knowing God, and of assenting to the reasons alleged for the demonstration of His existence: for in this sense the knowledge of whatever other truths, just as also of God, could and ought to be said to be coeval with human souls. But, in the matter of Engrafted Theology, it happens in a manner similar to other κοιναῖς ἐννοίαις, *common notions*, for instance, twice two are four, and it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be, etc., which so shine with their own light, that, with the signification of the words with which they are advanced hardly comprehended, the soul proceeds of its own will unto the assent of the same, just as soon as a suitable occasion of understanding concerning them occurs. In a manner like unto these

propositions, God exists, parents are to be honored, the neighbor is not to be injured, to everyone is to be granted his due, etc., with the sense understood, the certainty of the same appears to be known of itself to everyone capable of reason, to such an extent that the soul, without regard to the exigencies of demonstration, by nature is prone to assent to them. Of which sort is the proneness of nature to acknowledge God and to support the Law of nature, because it pertains to the very Light of Reason, and is present in man before all demonstration; in this sense with good reason we speak of Innate Theology: which, when it puts itself forth in act, our AUTHOR thus rightly says *flows from an innate faculty and instinct of the mind, together with the use of reason*. Compare VRIESIUS' *Diatribam de Ideis Innatis*, Section X, § 1-3, pages 85-87, Section XI, § 1-6, pages 93-100, Section XII, § 1-5, pages 100-105. Whether the Reverend GISBERT BONNET,¹ in his *Disputatione de Notitia eorum, quæ Mens humana nec directe nec positive cognoscere potest*, § 37-50, rightly endeavors to render the Noëtic Knowledge of God of this sort doubtful, contending that all knowledge of God is *discursive*, although he affirms that the same is also able deservedly to be called *Innate*, let the more prudent consider. We prove that:

α. *from the Holy Scripture*, which, our AUTHOR observes,

1. makes mention of this Theology as far as the *Theoretical* part, which consists in the recognition of God as Independent and Most Holy, Romans 1:19. The Most Illustrious VRIESIUS, in his *Diatriba de Ideis Innatis*, Section IX, § 5-7, recognizes indeed that Natural Theology is treated here; but he refers *verse 19*, just as also *verse 20*, to Natural Theology Acquired, for in *verse 20* by the γὰρ/*for*² in the former connection are confirmed the same things that had already been set forth in *verse 19*, with the manner more distinctly related whereby God ἐφανερώσε/*showed* τὸ γνωστὸν αὐτοῦ, *what may be known of Him*, to the Gentiles; and he appeals to the consent of *Beza* and *Calvin*. Compare also the Most Illustrious VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, *posterior Section*, *chapter IV*, § 5, *page 206*. Certainly it is

¹ Gijsbert Bonnet (1723-1805) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Utrecht (1761-1804).

² Romans 1:19, 20: "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For (γὰρ) the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse..."

not able to be denied that in *verses* 19 and 20 the same γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *what might be known of God*, is treated in opposition to τὸ πιστὸν, *what might be believed*. But, as this is disclosed to men in more than one way, so also Theologians are not destitute of their own reckonings, who find in these verses a diverse mode of manifestation also, internal and external, immediate and mediate. And for an acknowledgement of Innate Theology, in *verse* 19 they think to be supportive, *a.* that ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in them*, within them, as it were, and, as the Apostle speaks in Romans 2:15, that ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, *in their hearts*, as if Paul said that they have no necessity to acquire for themselves the knowledge of Deity from elsewhere, but have τὸ γνωστὸν, *what may be known*, of God within themselves. *b.* That ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφάνερωσε, *for God hath shewed it unto them*, will have greater emphasis, if it be explained of a manifestation made immediately by God to man internally, than of such a manifestation outside of man, the use of which man was obliged to claim for himself by means of ratiocination. *c.* The preceding *verse* 18 is also supportive of this, in which the Apostle speaks of the Gentiles as somewhat instructed in the knowledge of the ἀληθείας/*truth*; but which κατεῖχον, *they suppressed*, that is, by force, since it was disposed to burst forth, and that indeed ἐν ἀδικία, *in unrighteousness*,¹ by which they were showing themselves to be practical Atheists, living as if God would not hear nor see, nor appear as a just Judge. But whence proves Paul that truth latent within? Διότι/*for*, says he in *verse* 19, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, etc., *that which may be known of God is manifest in them*, etc.

But, as far as it concerns the causal particle γὰρ/*for* in the beginning of *verse* 20, it is indeed certain that it is used in this sense *at the end of verse* 19,² but nothing opposes so as to prevent that γὰρ *at the beginning of verse* 20 being taken in some other signification, whether in an adversative sense, *but*, in comparison with 1 Peter 4:15,³ or it be

¹ Romans 1:18: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold (κατεχόντων) the truth (τὴν ἀλήθειαν) in unrighteousness (ἐν ἀδικία)...”

² Romans 1:19: “Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for (γὰρ) God hath shewed it unto them.”

³ 1 Peter 4:14, 15: “If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you: on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified. But (γὰρ) let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men's

thought to serve as a transition, *moreover*, in comparison with 2 Timothy 2:7,¹ or it answer to an adverb of asservation, in comparison with Philippians 2:27, where it is able to be rendered, *assuredly indeed*.² In the whole of this consideration shall be the intention of the Apostle, that not only one argument within man for the Existence of the glory-worthy Deity is presented; but that, however many things have been created, just so many things outside of man are additionally present as witnesses of this truth: so much more ἀναπολόγητος/*inexcusable* is man rendered, who does not allow himself to be brought unto the worship of God by so many arguments. Unless we desire to observe that, within all the ποιήματα/*works* mentioned in verse 20,³ not to be reckoned in the last place is the human soul with that innate consciousness, which manifests to all men τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *that which may be known of God*. Since verse 20 by the causal γὰρ/*for* is legitimately conjoined with the prior verse, accordingly verse 20 undoubtedly contains more than verse 19; but, among other things, also that which had been asserted in verse 19; to which point tends the observation of the Eminent NIEUWENTYT, in his *Gronden van zekerheid*, part III, chapter IV, § 2, page 231. Add that Acquired Natural Theology is to such an extent easily learned by men from those things that are ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in them*, from a consideration of their own soul, and of its conjunction with the body and operation in the body, so that it might hardly seem necessary to send man off unto the other ποιήματα/*works*. And thus the principia and proofs of the twofold Natural Theology, Innate and Acquired, man has ἐν αὐτῷ, *in him*, neither of which is it necessary to exclude in verse 19.

2. But also Innate Theology with respect to its *Practical* aspect is confirmed in Sacred Scripture, Romans 2:14, 15, from which passage one may argue thus:

a. When the Gentiles, having not the Law, by

matters.”

¹ 2 Timothy 2:7: “Consider what I say; and (γὰρ) the Lord give thee understanding in all things.”

² Philippians 2:26, 27: “For he longed after you all, and was full of heaviness, because that ye had heard that he had been sick. For indeed (καὶ γὰρ) he was sick nigh unto death: but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow.”

³ Romans 1:20: “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made (τοῖς ποιήμασι), even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse...”

nature do those things which belong to the Law, and have the Law written on the heart: then the knowledge of the Law is natural. But:

b. When there is a natural knowledge of the Law, then there is also a knowledge of the Lawgiver: for Law and Lawgiver are related things, which go together.

c. The conscience, accusing in the case of evil deeds, and excusing in the case of good deeds, is natural to man.

Conscience of this sort involves the Knowledge of an Independent Lawgiver, to whose absolute dominion all things belonging to man, even his very Conscience, are subjected, who is no other than God.

Therefore, the Knowledge of God as the Independent Lawgiver and just Judge is Natural to man. Consult ABRAHAM LEDEBOER'S *Verhandeling over het Zedlyk Gevoel*, pages 103-128, tome III; *Dissertationem moralem pro Legato Stolpiano*, HENNERT, dissertation I, § 5, pages 20-22.

It is not as one might take *Exception*:

a. That not the *Law* itself, but the *work of the Law*, is said to be by nature inscribed. *Responses*: 1. The *Law* and the *work of the Law* in this context go together. 2. If by the *work of the Law* you wish to understand that which the Law furnished by commanding, threatening, promising rewards; which in the place of the Law the conscience urges within man: nevertheless, the *work of the Law* includes the Law itself and the knowledge of its argument.

b. That, when the Law is said to be inscribed in hearts, it does not therefore signify that the Law is Innate; but only that it is known to the Gentiles, as to the Jews the Law of Moses was known by revelation. *Responses*: 1. The inscription of the work of the Law in the heart of Gentiles is a metaphorical phrase taken from the inscription of the Law upon the stony tables by the finger of God: and here it is said that the Law, by nature inscribed upon the heart of the Gentiles, was also inscribed by the power of God in such a way that by the grace of the Spirit the same is inscribed far more perfectly in those covenanted to God.¹ 2. He observes that the γραπτόν, *thing written*, is implicitly efficient, γεγραμμένον ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, *having been written by God*: now, God inscribes the Law in the heart of the Gentiles, since *He formed the heart itself*, Psalm 33:15. 3. *They do by nature those things which are of the*

¹ Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10; 10:16.

Law; therefore, they received the Law with and from nature. 4. The conscience is the effect and consequence of this Law: but the former is natural; Therefore also the latter has been revealed naturally to man, as opposed to the external revelation of the Law that was made to the Jews: for the effect is not able to be prior to its cause.

c. That *the Gentiles are treated as converted*, for to them is attributed the Law inscribed on the heart, which is a promise of the covenant of grace, Jeremiah 31:33. *Responses*: 1. This is contrary to the scope of Paul, which is to demonstrate the ἀναπολογησίαν/*inexcusability* of all Nations. 2. The same are spoken of as νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες, *not having the Law*, that is, in such a way that this mark has been externally ascribed to them by God: but to whom God by the saving grace of the Spirit inscribes the Law within the heart, the same He is wont to bless also with the eternal revelation and preaching of the Law.

β. *Support* is added, 1. From *the universal Extension of this knowledge*: For what to all Nations universally, however barbarous, is common; that is rightfully held to be naturally innate. But Theology, or some knowledge of God, is common to all Nations, even the barbarous, as it is evident from experience. 2. What is so deeply impressed and so firmly inheres in the souls of men that it is able to be rooted out by no endeavor or pursuit, that is to them naturally innate: But some knowledge of God is so deeply impressed and so firmly inheres; especially that by which God is acknowledged as a witness, judge, and avenger of sins: Therefore, etc. The *Major* is evident; for things acquired are able to be effaced, but things natural are immutable. The *Minor* is proven *from the Fear of Conscience*, even in the case of hidden sins and the greatest men, which even with the greatest effort they have not been able to shake off. CICERO, in *pro Milone*, chapter XXIII, “The power of conscience is very great, O judges, and is of great weight on both sides; so that they that have done no wrong fear nothing, and they, on the other hand, that have done wrong think that banishment is always hanging over them.” TERTULLIAN, in *De Resurrectione Carnis*, chapter III, “I shall make use also of the conscience of the people, who call to witness the God of Gods. I shall make use also of other nations’ common ideas, which proclaim that God is judge, God sees, and I entrust it to God.” But just how great is the force of a perturbed conscience of this sort, one may see in the eminent example of Nero; who, although he was not expecting punishment to be inflicted by men on account of sending his mother to die, yet, that he was vexed above

measure by his sense of guilt over his crime, is read in SUETONIUS'¹ in *Vita Neronis*, chapter XXXIV, "Yet he was neither immediately nor ever afterwards able to bear the sense of guilt for this crime, although he was encouraged by the congratulatory addresses of the army, the senate, and people, often confessing that he was harassed by his mother's ghost, and by the whips and burning torches of the Furies. Indeed, he attempted by magical rites to call forth and to prevail upon the ghosts." Compare Acts 24:25; Jonah 1:5-7.

γ. But if we should desire human testimony also, we heard already from CICERO'S *de natura Deorum*, book II, chapter V, "And so among all of all nations the opinion stands firm; for it is innate in all and, as it were, engraved in the soul, that there are Gods." Also elsewhere CICERO calls this *Knowledge of God Innate*, having been received from *nature*, and hence universal, stable, and true; see what things from him *Anonymous* cites in *Dissertationem ad Theologiam naturalem pro Legato Stolpiano*, tome II, on the question *pro anno 1775*, page 134.

Compare BUDDEUS, disputing in favor of Innate Theology against *Atheists* and others, among whom he especially names *Locke*,² *Institutionibus Theologiæ Moralis*, part II, chapter II, § 35, pages 397-401; and *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter V, § I, pages 225-229; on which place still consult LULOFS' *Annotationes ad eum* (153, 154), pages 230-232.

¹ Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus (c. 75- c. 130) was a Roman historian.

² John Locke (1632-1704) was an English philosopher and a founder of the school of Empiricists. He denied that man has any innate ideas, but is rather born as a *tabula rosa*, a *blank slate*.

§ 13: Natural Theology: Acquired

Then follows the Natural Knowledge of God, *Objective, Acquired, Dianoëtic*, which is acquired by the contemplation of Objects a great many, and situated outside of ourselves, through discursive reasoning: and that through the threefold path of *Causality, Negation, and Eminence*, commonly ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite. That is, as often as I consider a thing as dependent (in which manner primarily all creatures are distinguished from the Creator), soon I am led by the *Way of Causality* into this recognition, that no perfection is contained in a dependent effect that was not already contained in its first Cause. Then I discover that every perfection of Creatures has annexed to itself many imperfections, which are altogether inconsistent with the Independence of the Creator: and so the *Way of Negation* comes to help, removing all that on account of which such a predicate is not able properly to be attributed to the Independent Being. But now, while from the removal of imperfection follows the positing of the opposite perfection, our mind tries further by the *Way of Eminence* to magnify the concept of that perfection until it appears to think something that is able to be attributed to God, without prejudice to His Independence. In the following example VRIESIUS illustrates this, in his *Exercitationibus rationalibus* VI, § 6. I observe that the Creature *endures*: thence by the way of Causality I gather that also, therefore, the Creator endures. But the Creature endures by an endurance dependent, finite, and contingent: this mode of enduring I judge by the way of Negation not to agree with the Independent Creator. Finally, the Way of Eminence contemplates that God endures in a manner infinitely more perfect than what is able to be conceived of by me: whence finally a concept of the divine perfection, which is called *Eternality*, results. Sacred Scripture goes before in this threefold Way of knowing, in which the way of *Causality* occurs, Psalm 94:9; Acts 17:28, 29; the way of *Negation*, Numbers 23:19; the way of *Eminence*, Matthew 7:11; Isaiah 55:8, 9; 1 Timothy 6:15. The same manner of discursive reasoning, to acquire further knowledge of God, see excellently illustrated by the Reverend GISBERT BONNET, in his *Disputatione de Notitia eorum, quæ Mens humana nec directe nec positive cognoscere potest*, § 51-59. This Acquired Natural Theology is useful for the helping and perfecting of Innate Theology.

Now, the same is proven from a great many Passages, among which those are clearest, which are here cited, Psalm 19:1, 2; etc.

Socinus, in his *Prælectionibus Theologicis*, chapter II, *opera Fausti Socini*, tome I, page 538, takes exception against this passage, 1. Because the Heavens are indeed said to declare *the glory of God*, but not God Himself and His Existence as Creator. *Response*: The Glory of God involves and supposes His Existence; such that, if the heavens declare the Glory of God, they also would declare His Existence as Creator. Just as, if I should say of some clock or edifice, that it argues the Wisdom of the artificer; by this very thing I shall as much as possible signify at the same time that from the work itself it is proven that it was made by some artificer, and that it did not come together by some chance of wheels or coincidence of stone.

Exception 2: *All the earth*¹ is to be restricted to Judea alone, in which the light of revelation was shining. *Response*: The language of *all the earth with the ends of the world* is not able to be taken so restrictively here; in which the entire circuit of the Heavens and of the whole Firmament is treated, through which are extended the vicissitudes of day and night, under which a variety of speech and languages obtain, and in which the glory of the Creator is displayed by the elegance of the work; and in which the Sun not only has its own tabernacle, but also that through which it runs from one end to the other: indeed, the same words are used by Paul unto the signification of the entire world, which, therefore, in these things was understood by him.

Neither, 3. is it to be *excepted* with others also, that here supernatural Revelation through the Gospel is treated, from the Pauline citation of this passage in Romans 10:18, which sort of mystical explication of the former part of this *Psalm*, following those things which are read in the works of Tertullian, Augustine, and Jerome, has been embraced by more recent men among the Papists, Lutherans, and Reformed. For there is no indication in the writing of Paul, from which it might be proven that he cites the words of the Psalmist as a proof, as if David in them prophesied of the future, universal preaching of the Gospel: but Paul sets forth this Universal preaching of the Gospel, which from the event itself is sufficiently evident as having already begun to happen; indeed, he sets it forth in words suitable for this matter, which David had formerly used of the preaching of Nature, through a certain sort of Accommodation, or translation of the words of David

¹ Verse 4.

unto another subject, as if he should say, Certainly it is able now to be said truly of the preaching of the Gospel, what David sang concerning the heavens and the firmament; namely, that their sound and words had penetrated unto the ends of the earth, and that they were able to be heard clearly by all. For verily David commends Theology Natural and Supernatural at the same time in this *Psalms*, the former in *verses* 1-6, the latter in *verses* 7-14; in such a way that he subordinates the natural to the supernatural, and lifts the latter above the former: for he proposes that the perfections and glory of God are able to be understood naturally indeed from the creatures; but that, nevertheless, the doctrine of supernatural revelation in the Sacred Books is far more excellent.

Acts 14:17: In which are treated the Gentiles, which God formerly allowed to walk in their ways, but to which notwithstanding He gave His *testimony*. But of what sort? by natural benefits: *He filled their hearts with εὐφροσύνη/gladness*, but resulting from the largess of *food*: but that food was granted to them by the help of *rain* and other things procuring καρποφόρα./fruitful seasons. But rain and fertile season from heaven are from God, comparing Jeremiah 5:24; 14:22.

Acts 17:25-27: ψηλαφήσειαν καὶ εὔροιεν, that is, *by groping about they might find*. The incorporeal God is most certainly felt by the mind in corporeal creatures, yet less distinctly, and not so clearly as by Revelation: just as indeed by handling we apprehend an object, yet not so clearly do we know it by touch as by sight: compare § 20, *Objection* 5, of this *Chapter*.

Romans 1:20: This passage is not to be evaded with the Socinians, with the result that those things, which were ἀόρατα ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, *invisible from the creation of the world*, now are said to be exposed to sight, ποιήμασι, *by the things that are made*, that is, *through the marvelous works of God Himself and of inspired men, but especially of Christ and His Apostles*; namely, God's αἰδίων δύναμιν καὶ θεϊότητα, *eternal power and Godhead*, that is, *the promises of the Gospel, which are never lost, and that which God wills that we continually do*, comparing Romans 1:16; Colossians 2:9: see Socinus' *Prælectiones Theologicas*, chapter II, *Opera Fausti Socini*, tome I, page 538; *Catechesin Racoviensem* "de Via Salutis", chapter I, questions 8-10, page 22-24. For thus the Nations would be judged to be less ἀναπολόγητοι/inexcusable, which is contrary to the aim/scope and reasoning of Paul. But the divinity and eternal power of the Creator, having regard unto τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *that which may be known of*

God,¹ *God invisible to corporeal eyes, are observed by the mind and thoughts, thence from the creation of the world, in the things created and through them; whence all Nations not worthily worshipping God are judged inexcusable: consult ARNOLDI'S Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ, on the place cited, § 45-54, pages 71-75; likewise BECMANN'S² Exercitationes theologicas, II, page 27, who on pages 25 and 26 in a similar manner frees the text of Psalm 19:1 from the exceptions of Socinus.*

The wisest of the Gentiles support these and the many other testimonies of Scripture; see below in *Chapter VIII*, § 4, 6, even the greatest Experimental Physicists, as proven by their very words, given by the Eminent NIEUWENTYT in his *Gronden van Zekerheid*, part III, chapter III, pages 227-230, who himself prepared his entire *Cosmotheoriam*, a work worthy of cedar, unto this end.

Those among the Socinians, CRELLIUS³ on Romans 1:20, and SCHLICHTING on the same passage and elsewhere, do not disapprove.

Consult in favor of Acquired natural Theology CALVIN'S *Institutionem Christianæ Religionis*, book I, chapter V; and HOORNBEECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum*, tome I, book I, chapter VII, part II, pages 150-174.

Now, while in this demonstration of the divine Existence and perfections from the contemplation of the Creatures the Sacred Scripture so often goes before us, it had certainly not been fitting for the persuasiveness of the argument sought from the Idea of God, as if uniquely demonstrative, to enervate completely this mode of argument: see the Most Illustrious LEYDEKKER'S *Facem Veritatis*, locus III, controversy V.

¹ Verse 19.

² Christian Becmann (1580-1648) was a German Reformed theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Zerbst (1627-1648).

³ Johannes Crellius (1590-1633) was a one of the Polish Brethren and an influential Socinian theologian. His son and grandson were also proponents of Socinian views.

§ 14: Acquired Natural Theology and Universal Doubt

Before those things that our AUTHOR teaches positively concerning Innate and Acquired Natural Theology, he would free from the Objections of Adversaries, he interposes parenthetically one and another observation: of which *the first* is;

For the acquiring of Natural Theology there is to be no urging of *Universal Doubt* concerning all things, and even *concerning both the perfections, and the Existence, of God Himself*. This thesis is opposed to the method of philosophizing that *Descartes* plausibly urged from this *principium*, that the Arguments hitherto alleged for the Existence of God are not sufficiently persuasive and demonstrative. But DESCARTES relates in his *Epistola X, part II Epistolarum*: *If anyone should propose to himself as a goal to doubt concerning God, that he might persist in this doubt, he sins gravely, as long as he wills to remain in doubt in a matter of such moment. But, if anyone should propose this doubt to himself as a means to achieve a clearer knowledge of the truth, he does a thing altogether pious and honest, for no one is able to desire the end without at the same time desiring the means.... Neither does he sin, who for the sake of the same end for a time banishes from the soul the entirety of the knowledge that he has concerning God.* That this is indeed the thesis and mind of Descartes, that in order to acquire Natural Theology there must even be doubt concerning the Existence of God Himself, shows the Most Illustrious WITSIUS, in his *Het aanstotelyke Nieuw ontdekt*, § 11-24, pages 11-29, and in a tract, *Twist des Heeren met zynen Wyngaard*, chapter XXI, pages 262-267, while at the same time greatly abhorring this thesis. Indeed, our AUTHOR rightly observes that *Doubt* of this sort, especially *concerning the Existence of God*, is:

1. *Useless*, since Doubt as such does not suggest a proof of Deity; and after protracted Doubt more, and more effective, Arguments in favor of the Existence of God shall not be supplied to anyone, than those which without Doubt, from the testimony of conscience, the senses, reason, and consent of all peoples, he had known, or had been able to know even before that: of which Arguments also the force, greater or lesser, is able to be weighed, with this innate principium always remaining certain and indubitable, namely, *God exists*.

2. This Doubt is *Impossible*, since persuasion concerning the

Existence of God is related to κοινὰς ἐννοίας, *common notions*, and innate truths, which by the force of their own certainty exclude all Doubt, in such a way that that persuasion causes itself to be felt before a man might pursue the policy concerning Doubt: and to such an extent that, unless you wish to lay aside and forswear the light of reason and the conscience, Doubt of this sort is and remains impossible.

3. The same is also *Impious*: *a.* For those things, which I recited out of Descartes above, mean no other thing than that all those do a thing pious and honest that intend to become Atheists for a time, that they might thereafter cease to be Atheists; which thesis is in fact impious: For it belongs to the *Impious and foolish to say in their heart, there is no God*, Psalm 10:4; 14:1. *b.* While calling the Existence of God into doubt, for so long he lives *without God in the world*, and consequently *without hope of salvation*, Ephesians 2:12. *c.* Our moral dependence requires of us each and every moment love, honor, fear, and worship toward the Creator, and faith concerning God and in God, without which it is impossible to please Him, Hebrews 11:6. And he that doubts of God also regards it as necessary to doubt concerning his own Dependence upon Him, and his obligation unto the dictate of natural Law and unto all worship of God. Therefore, Doubt of this sort is hurtful to piety, draws away from the worship of God, and is a way prone to practical Atheism. The goal, which is intended as good, is not profitable: for one may not, so that good may come, do evil even for a moment, Romans 3:8.

4. Finally, Doubt of this sort is *most dangerous*: *a.* For, if there is to be doubt concerning the Existence of God, which is an innate truth, it is to be doubted concerning all other principia known of themselves. But in this way an impregnable bulwark Atheism and Scepticism shall have, which are able to be overturned only by the help of supposing with certainty some immediate truths. *b.* If any should also strive to obscure the evident certitude of that assertion, *God exists*, by affected doubt, and thus in actuality wrongly to detain the truth from issuing forth; they have reason to fear lest they fall into the judgment of the Nations, which, because it did not seem good to them to retain God in their knowledge, He delivered unto a mind without any judgment, Romans 1:28 compared with *verse 18*. Descartes himself, having whirled about in the dizziness of Doubt *for nine years*, affirms that *he feared lest this very thing, which he had undertaken, be so arduous and difficult, that it would be expedient to very few to imitate*, *Discours de la Méthode*, pages 8-10, compared with pages 18, 19.

Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ οἱ παλαιᾶτατοι τῶν φιλοσόφων ἐπὶ τὸ ἀμφισβητεῖν καὶ ἀπορεῖν ἐφέροντο· ὅπου γ' ἂν ἡμεῖς οἱ τῆς ὄντως ἀληθοῦς ἀντεχόμενοι φιλοσοφίας, *but the most ancient Philosophers were not suffered to contend nor to doubt; still less we, who embrace that which is truly philosophy*: CLEMENT of Alexandria in his *Stromata*, at the beginning of book VIII.

The Most Illustrious COCCEIUS, in *ad ultimum Mosis*, § 74, says these words, “It comes here to be wondered at, even a new pestilence sprouting at this time, of those that induce the soul to doubt, whether they themselves be, see, hear, etc. Wretched mortals, who reason against their own sense, doubting themselves to be, and daring to profess themselves to be infidels and ἀθέους/*atheists*, at least while they are willing to doubt; thereon they are going to apply themselves to this, that they might question all things, with respect to which they are able to delay their confidence (which the Scripture calls *reasonings* and *murmurings*¹), and remove from themselves the knowledge of God and His ways.” Add what things are found in his *Summa Theologiæ*, chapter VIII, § 25, *opera*, tome 7, page 160.

1. The followers of Descartes do not escape, contending that Doubt is nothing other than a suspension of judgment: although, *a*. Doubt and suspension of judgment do differ from each other, as antecedent and consequent. Doubt is, of course, a fluctuation of Judgment, vacillating between two opposed opinions; by which fluctuation, on account of the more or less equal weight of reasons on both sides, one inclines sometime more to this side, sometimes more to that side. Which vacillation the suspension of peremptory Judgment follows: in which, inasmuch as the mind frees itself and passes unto either, one undertakes both to seek and to examine reasons. And so the suspension of Judgment already supposes Doubt, which ought not to have a place except in doubtful matters. *b*. But, that Descartes understood by Doubt something more than a simple suspension of assent and examination of reasons, is able to be gathered, *α*. from the similitudes by which Descartes illustrates the activity of *Doubting*, as of the pulling down of a house unto its foundations, so that a better might be able to be built up in its place; of a basket full of fruit, from which all things are indiscriminately cast out, when we fear that any of them might

¹ Philippians 2:14: “Do all things without murmurings (γογγυσμῶν) and disputings (διαλογισμῶν, or *reasonings*)...”

be putrid, so that thereafter those things, which we observe to be uncorrupted, we might recover with the rest left behind. β . From the vocabulary, of which that Author and his followers make use as almost synonyms to the word *Doubt*, for example, to reject or not to renounce anything completely; to restrain carefully assent not less than from things manifestly false; to invent imaginary falsehoods; to affirm nothing of those things, which previously he affirmed or denied; to shake out of the soul; to remove altogether as if they be false; to hold as false; to reckon among falsehoods; etc. c . But it is not lawful to suspend Judgment without impiety, to restrain assent concerning the recognition of the Existence of God, by neither affirming nor denying that there is a God.

2. The Cartesian objection is not consistent, that we all in sleep or doing something else disregard for a time knowledge that we have concerning God. *Response*: As a matter of fact, negatively, and only at that time, do we not draw forth the act of that knowledge, for it is not possible to do all things at one time; but not positively do we disregard that knowledge: we retain habitual assent unto that proposition, God Exists, being inclined to confer actual assent at whatever moment. Consult PIERRE-DANIEL HUET'S¹ *Censuram Philosophiæ Cartesianæ*, chapter I; PETRUS VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, prior Section, chapter II, page 13-33, compared with the *Præfatio* § 9, 10; BUDDEUS' *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter I, § 25, pages 88-90. What is able to be produced to excuse Descartes in this business, the Most Illustrious HEIDANUS² has carefully gathered in his *Considerationibus* on the edict of the Curators of the Academy of Leiden, in which, on January 16, 1676, among other theses they also forbad that this be taught, "All things are to be doubted, even the Existence of God, and they are to be doubted in such a way that they are held as false," pages 116-134.

¹ Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630-1721) was a Roman Catholic churchman and a universal scholar. He was the cofounder of the Academie du Physique in Caen.

² Abraham Heidanus (1597-1678) was a Dutch Reformed minister and Cocceian theologian. He served as professor of theology at Leiden from 1648 to 1676, but was ultimately dismissed for his Cartesianism.

§ 15: The Idea of God

The other observation of our Most Illustrious AUTHOR follows, in which he declares what is to be held concerning the *Idea of God* so much harped upon, and the *Argument sought from it for the Existence of God*.

Descartes constructs particularly from that a twofold demonstration for the Existence of God, of which the one is wont to be called *à priori*, the other *à posteriori*.

The *first* stands thus:

Whatever attributes are contained in the clear Idea of anything, those of themselves by that fact are able to be attributed to that very thing. But in the clear Idea of a Being consummately perfect among other perfections is contained necessary Existence. Therefore, this by that fact is able to be attributed to that; consequently God also in reality exists necessarily.

The demonstration *à posteriori* thus proceeds: Each of our ideas requires a cause, in which either formally or eminently are contained the perfections, which are represented in the Idea. Now, we have an Idea of God as an infinitely perfect Being. Therefore, it shall have some cause, containing in itself either formally or eminently those perfections that are represented in such an Idea, namely, infinite perfections. But in no finite things do infinite perfections exist. Therefore, something infinitely perfect is given, in which all those perfections are contained, and which is thus the cause of that Idea: which very thing is God. See DESCARTES' *de prima Philosophia*, *Meditation III*, pages 21-24, *Meditation V*, pages 32-34.

Now, *Descartes* has so pleased himself in these things that he does not hesitate to commend them to the Sorbonne, or to the Theological faculty of Paris, as *demonstrations* altogether accurate, *most evident, most certain, indeed such concerning which the necessity of the case and the glory of God compel to be professed, for he does not think that any way is open to human ingenuity through which better ones might ever be able to be found*; he asks the Sorbonne according to its own authority to be willing publicly to declare and testify what sort they are, *Epistola ad Sorbonam*, page 3.

Now, with respect to these we observe:

1. That by *Ideas* are wont to be understood the *exemplars* and

actual forms of the things to be made, in the mind of the artisan, according to HOORNBEECK in his *Miscellaneis Sacris*, book II, chapter XXVI, pages 262-264. But, when *Idea* is taken broadly, for whatever concept, notion, or representation that by cogitation we contemplate, always to denote the *actual* concept; whence we are said to form an idea, to contemplate and follow it as an exemplar: then a denomination of this sort hardly fits snugly with the innate knowledge of God.

2. It is manifest that the clearer and more distinct is the Idea or representation of a thing in the intellect, the more perfect it is, and the more profoundly it penetrates the thing to be known. On the other hand, it is evident that all and the individual predicates of a thing infinitely perfect, as those predicates are in themselves, are not able to be comprehended entirely by a finite intellect, and that to such an extent no adequate Idea of God is given. Indeed, the more deeply we penetrate into the knowledge of the divine perfections, the more our cogitations are almost overwhelmed by its awe-inspiring majesty; and we always sense that there are always more things remaining to be known: whence a clear and distinct Idea of God is hardly able to be attributed to us, still less that God is said to be known by us more clearly and distinctly than every other thing, whom of all things, in accordance with all and the individual predicates, as they are in themselves, the mind is least able to set before itself as present. An excessive disproportion here obtains between the perceiving subject and the object to be perceived, to such an extent that our mind is generally related to the knowledge of infinite Deity, as the eye of the owl to the regard of the meridian light. Indeed, the Reverend GISBERT BONNET, in his *Disputatione de Notitia eorum, quæ Mens humana nec directe nec positive cognoscere potest*, § 38-44, is totally absorbed in this, that he might show that we are able to have no Idea of infinite Being as such.

3. That the ideas both of God and of all or most other things are innate in us, which hence are to be held as the standard of truth, is a thesis never proven, but which the Most Illustrious VRIESIUS, in his *Diatriba de Ideis Innatis*, with great pains has undertaken to confute. On the other hand, those that love to philosophize soberly thus establish, that from the Idea of anything in our mind nothing is able to be concluded except Ideally, as long as it is not established by a trial undertaken, that the thing for its part conforms to our Ideas. Indeed, when we begin to appeal to our Ideas as the standard of truth, we hardly differ from the Quakers, having recourse to their inner light, and from

this evaluating all things and acting.

4. With respect to Descartes' demonstration for the Existence of God sought from the Idea, this adduces a *dianoëtic* Knowledge of the Existence of God only; while above we have evinced an Innate, *noëtic* Knowledge of God, which is prior and simpler.

5. If you have regard specifically unto the *Demonstration à priori* set forth above, you would indeed say that this is a bare and vain Circular Argument; seeing that, by supposing that which is in Question, namely, whether God exists, one proves only that God exists necessarily. It is not proper to infer anything from this syllogism, except conditionally; if the thing exists outside of my mind in all respects similar to the Idea, which I have of it. And to such an extent the Atheist will be able to concede all this, namely, that necessary Existence pertains to the Essence of Being, the Idea of which you represent to yourself: yet he will not be moved from his opinion until you give a proof of the Existence of a Being of this sort outside of the mind. For, just as I say that necessary Existence is contained in the distinct Idea of a consummately perfect Being; so also it is permissible to say that in the Idea of a mountain actually burning, of a candle actually shining, of a horse actually flying, actual Existence is necessarily involved; for, unless they exist, they are not able to burn, to light, to fly. But this bond shall remain true, even if there be no burning mountain, no lighting candle, no flying horse, outside of the mind; neither is the actual existence of these things proven in this manner.

It does not help, with the Most Illustrious BURMAN,¹ in his *Synopsi Theologiæ*, tome I, book I, chapter XIV, § 8, to add for the sake of illustration, *To exist necessarily is as clearly and necessarily perceived to be contained in the Idea of a Being infinitely perfect, as the concept of a mountain in the concept of a valley; even as the nature of a triangle is not able to be distinctly conceived, unless it is understood to have three angles equal to two right angles.* For these things will always be true, even if there remain no mountain, no valley, no triangle, outside my Idea in the nature of things.

The Eminent NIEUWENTYT, in his *Gronden van Zekerheid*, part II, chapter XXII, has provided an ample examination of this reasoning, and has brought its shallowness into the light. He then, in *Gronden van*

¹ Frans Burman (1628-1679) was a Dutch Reformed theologian and a Cartesian. He served as Professor of Theology (1662-1671) and Professor of Church History (1671-1679) at Utrecht.

Zekerheid, part IV, chapter XIII, shows in what manner Spinoza¹ imitates this argumentation of Descartes, and by similar reasoning gives sophistical proof for the necessary Existence of his God.

It is not to be omitted that DESCARTES himself, in his *Responsione ad primam Objectionem*, page 62, writes: "I shall not here deny that this argument is such that those who do not call to mind all the things that make for the proof of it are going to hold it as sophistry, and that therefore initially I doubted somewhat whether I ought to make use of it; lest perchance to those, who might not grasp it, I might give occasion to distrust the rest also."

And it is worthy of observation that the Most Illustrious Röellius,² who stirred up sharp controversy with *Vriesius concerning innate Ideas* and in particular on account of the undermined Argument *à posteriori* from the Idea of God; that, I say, this very Röellius did not acknowledge the force of the Argument *à priori*; accordingly someone in the *Disputation* held under the supervision of Röellius, soon after the beginning, asserts that *already for some time to him this argument was admired, when he began somewhat more diligently to attend upon and to weigh the reasons, which the Most Illustrious Preceptor and President was alleging to the contrary*. And he then concludes that *this argument does not proceed simply and of itself from the Idea of God to His Existence: that that which is in question is supposed; while the Existence of God is presupposed, and then finally it is inferred that the Existence of God is necessary; for which reason he speaks against the hypothesis, that it is mistaken*: VRIESIUS' *Diatriba de Ideis Innatis*, Section I, § 5; compare also the younger VITRINGA'S³ *Dissertationem Inauguralem*, chapter IV, § 4, and his *Dissertationes Sacras*, page 509; and especially the *Dissertationes* of GOEDENIUS,⁴ REEDER, etc., *de argumento Cartesii aliorumque pro Existencia Dei ex Idea Entis Perfectissimi ac Necessarii à Priori*, written at the request of the Curators of *Legate Stolpianus*, and published by these in 1768.

6. But neither is the *Demonstration à posteriori* valid. *a.* That is,

¹ Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) was a Jewish-Dutch philosopher, and one of the great Rationalists in the tradition of Descartes.

² Hermann Alexander Röell (1653-1718) was a Dutch Reformed philosopher and theologian. He served as Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Franeker (1685-1704), and as Professor of Natural Theology at Utrecht (1704-1718).

³ Campegius Vitringa the Younger (1693-1723) was a Dutch Reformed theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1715-1723).

⁴ Johannes Levinus Goeden (1700-1799) was a Dutch Reformed Pastor.

the Idea, that represents God in all respects, as He exists in Himself, necessarily requires an infinite cause of it, for such itself is also infinite. But the human mind is not able to have an Idea of this sort: for the ability to conceive cannot be greater than the mind itself; therefore, since the latter is finite, the former shall also be so. Whence it follows that our finite mind by any clear Idea is not able positively to represent to itself infinite perfections as such. *b.* Yet the mind does know in some small measure the infinitely perfect; but not otherwise than by multiplying finite perfections, and by withdrawing from them all limits and imperfections; and finally by judging that it is greater than what can be comprehended by a finite mind. All which are able to be done by our mind with sufficient aptness, as VRIESIUS, in his *Diatriba de Ideis Innatis*, Section VIII, proluxly demonstrates. Indeed, DESCARTES himself acknowledges, in his *Responsione ad primam Objectionem*, page 59, that a positive Concept of Infinity does not come down to man: "With respect to," says he, "the Infinite, or a formal account of an Infinite thing, even if we understand that to be as positive as possible, yet we only understand it in a certain negative manner, from this, namely, that we observe no limitation in the thing." Now, that this pertains to the Idea of God, that He might be conceived of as a Being consummately perfect, we do not learn from this, that we thus observe Infinity to be Innate, but that we understand God to be the cause of every perfection; consequently, in Him as the cause we judge that every sort of perfection is to be considered deservedly, which presents itself here and there to be considered in whatever creatures. In thus forming the Idea of God as a Being Infinitely perfect, the *threefold Way* previously mentioned, of *Causality*, *Negation*, and *Eminence* shall help: consult also VRIESIUS' *Dissertationem de Infinito*, prior Section, which is *de Conceptu Infiniti*. *c.* Finally, the Atheist shall altogether deny having any clear Idea of infinite perfections, positively represented to the mind as such. Which is sufficient for him to deflect all the force of this reasoning, if there be any. Neither will it help to urge that he either understands what he denies, or does not understand, the latter of which would be absurd; if the former obtains, certainly he has an Idea of the thing denied. For he shall retort that he therefore denies it, because he does not have an Idea of a Being of this sort as a thing containing a contradiction, neither is anyone able to have such an Idea. Consult on this VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænam Novitatum Cartesianarum*, posterior Section, chapter IV, pages 198-217; HUET'S *Censuram Philosophiæ Cartesianæ*, chapter IV, and his *Iter*

per Mundum Cartesii, pages 161-176: add the Most Illustrious WILLIAM IRHOVIUS¹ *Disquisitionem pneumatolicam de Intellectu Facultate vere active*, § 28-32, 37 and *following*, especially § 51-56, 72-81, 87-92. Consult BUDDEUS, arguing from Innate Theology against *Atheists* and others, among whom he first of all names *Locke*, *Institutionibus Theologiæ Moralis*, part II, chapter II, § 35, pages 397-401, and *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter V, § I, pages 225-229, on which place still consult LULOFS' *Annotationes* (153, 154), pages 230-232.

¹ Willem van Irhoven (1698-1760) was a Dutch Reformed Minister and Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology (1737-1740), and then as Professor of Church History (1740-1760) at Utrecht.

§ 16: Natural Theology before and and after the Fall

The third observation, which our AUTHOR here inserts, is that the Natural Theology of the Race-course obtained in a far more perfect degree in our First Parents in the State of Integrity, than now in the State of the Fall; which is immediately evident from the Creation of man in God's Image, an Image now greatly effaced and almost destroyed.

In particular, our AUTHOR contends that Intact man through this Natural, Theological Wisdom, apart from Special Revelation, which nevertheless he does not at all deny to him, knew both the entire moral Law, as the norm of his Actions; and the Triune God, as the Object of his religious Worship: which latter especially the Most Illustrious LEYDEKKER, in his *Face Veritatis*, locus IV, controversy IX, observes against LUDWIG VON WOLZOGEN, of the Walloon Church,¹ while he was living, Pastor at Groningen, Middelburg, Utrecht, and Amsterdam, and also Professor of History in the Gymnasium of Amsterdam, as previously Professor of Ecclesiastical History extraordinaire in the Academy of Utrecht,² in his *de Interprete Scripturarum*, book II, page 158, whose *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, *fundamental error*, Leydekker observes to be that in our Idea of God the concept of the Trinity is not involved; which Wolzogen himself indicates distinctly enough, writing in the *place cited*, "But that the Mystery of the Trinity was not known to the first man, except with God revealing it, appears to be confirmed, for in the image of God we know nothing that ascends higher than the divine essence and its properties." And he writes no less clearly in his *Censura Censuræ adversus Johannem de Labadie*,³ pages 175, 196, 197. But just as Wisdom and Original Righteousness were not of

¹ The Walloon Church was composed of members from the Southern Netherlands and France; services were generally conducted in French.

² Ludwig Wolzogen (1633-1690) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian. He served as Professor of Practical Philosophy at Groningen (1660-1663), Professor of Church History at Utrecht (1664-1670), and Professor of Church History at Amsterdam (1670-1690).

³ Jean de Labadie (1610-1674) was a Jesuit priest, converted to the Reformed Church in 1650. Over time, his views drifted toward a more radical pietism and communalism.

an *habit* infused into the first man, as the gift of tongues was into the Apostles, nor of an *habit* acquired by constant training; but *concreated*, as after the Fall Corruption is our inborn and innate habit: so also by no lesser right is Wisdom and Righteousness able to be said to be Natural to upright man, as after the Fall Corruption is wont to be said to be Natural to man. Therefore, if the Knowledge of the Triune God also pertains to this Wisdom of upright man, even this ought to be said to be Natural to man: but it is hardly able to be doubted that the Knowledge of the Triune God was inseparable from the nature of Upright man.

1. For, if man was Created *good* and *upright*,¹ he was created as apt for the glorification of God. The Glorification of God consists in the appropriate Worship of God. No one is able to furnish Worship pleasing to God without knowledge, both of the divine Will, and of the worship of the true God Himself. No one knows the true God, unless he recognizes Him to be Triune, as He is. Without this one is able to apprehend *Deity* in the abstract; but no one is able to be said to know *God* in the concrete, except one who knows Him who possesses the divine nature: but He is *Triune*. But divine Worship ought to be directed toward God in the concrete. Therefore, the good and upright Creation of man requires that at the same time with the remaining Wisdom and the knowledge of the moral Law was also concreated in man the Knowledge of God as Triune.

2. If you doubt, choose one or the other: Adam naturally proposed to himself God, either as Triune, which we maintain: or with only one personality; which cannot be admitted, unless you determine that upright Adam was implicated in a most grievous error concerning the highest Deity, which error supernatural Revelation then ought to have corrected.

3. Our knowledge of God, remaining after the sin, is excessively advanced, and that, which belonged to the first man, is at the same time excessively disparaged; when these two things are compared together in such a manner that from this fact, that now after sin we do not know the Trinity by Innate Theology, we conclude that neither was this knowledge Concreated in Upright man. On the contrary, from this difference between the Natural Theology of Upright man and of Fallen man the gravity of our Corruption, by which we are even ignorant of the true God, is able to be known.

It is not to be asserted that the Knowledge of the Trinity

¹ Ecclesiastes 7:29.

pertains chiefly to the mystery of the Redemption and Salvation of Fallen man, in which the Most Holy Trinity brilliantly revealed itself. For, *a.* by the Λόγον/*Word* and Spirit of His mouth God also created all things,¹ and so the *Creator* was also to be adored as Triune: *b.* and whatever may be, the Son and the Holy Spirit have always been ὁμοούσιοι/*consubstantial* with the Father and ἰσότιμοι, *equal in glory*, and so what we read in John 5:23 and 1 John 2:23 always equally obtains. Rightly, therefore, did the Most Illustrious WITSIUS, in his *De Œconomia Fœderum*, book I, chapter II, § 5-8; and his *Exercitatione VI in Symbolum*, § 14-19, wish to go against the Most Illustrious Amyraut,² who, having advanced further than the Reverend Wolzogen, contends in his *Dissertatione de Mystério Trinitatis*, page 121, and at greater length on page 158 and following, “The Economy that exists between the three persons of the Deity principally consists in the procuring of salvation for the human race, in such a way that the knowledge of it was not able to pertain to the state of innocence, in which there was no place for salvation or redemption.” Rightly again does Witsius in those same places teach that through repeated Revelations this Mystery of the Trinity was able more and more to become known to Adam. In addition, the same Witsius is able rightly to affirm that the doctrine of the Trinity is such that man is not able to draw it from the consideration of himself and the creatures alone; if you understand this with respect to Acquired Natural Theology, which is drawn from a contemplation of the creatures, among which also is man. For the fabric of the Soul and of the Body, or of the other Creatures, does not teach the Trinity. But nothing hinders this, so as to prevent that through Wisdom concreated with the Image of God, which Wisdom precedes Acquired Theology, man already possessed the knowledge of the Trinity, as the arguments brought by us above evince: which Natural Knowledge, nevertheless, was able to be confirmed further by added Revelations. The notices in this paragraph are also held against LAMPE, who, in his *de Fœdere Gratiae*, chapter II, § 15, page 51, does not dread to affirm that *God only appeared to Adam as His Creator*,

¹ Psalm 33:6: “By the word of the Lord (בְּדִבְרֵי יְהוָה; τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου, in the Septuagint) were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath (וְגִבּוֹרָתוֹ; τῷ πνεύματι, *by the Spirit*, in the Septuagint) of his mouth.”

² While studying at Saumur, Moïse Amyraut (1596-1664) was heavily influenced by hypothetical universalism of Scottish theologian John Cameron. He served as professor at Saumur (1633-1664), together with Louis Cappel and Josué de la Place.

Patron, Law-giver, and highest Good; Adam was able to stand in the Covenant of Works without it being regarded as necessary to know God as Triune.

§ 17: Defense of the Existence of Natural Theology

The Natural Theology previously asserted our AUTHOR now vindicates from the Objections of Adversaries, especially with relation to the Theology of Fallen Man.

Socinus and his followers deny this, and *Socinus* indeed denies both Innate Natural Theology, and even Acquired. *Socinus*, in his *Prælectionibus Theologicis*, chapter II, asserts that “it is false that there is an idea of any divinity naturally innate in man and in his soul;” and this he exerts himself to prove by several arguments, *Opera*, tome I, page 537, 538. And he writes on page 538a, “But there are those that say that it is not even possible to deny this, that from the scheme of this world alone, if anyone should pay attention, one is able manifestly to know, not only that there is a God, but also that He oversees and plainly perceives human affairs. This opinion is convicted of falsehood even from this, etc.” *Ostorodus*¹ in his *Institutionibus*, chapter I, joins in support. Nevertheless, some others of the Socinians think otherwise; and especially *Crellius*, who admits Natural Theology, at least as Acquired, and grants it as a thing approved by many, *libro de Deo et Attributis*, chapters I-IV. Unto the Socinians *Episcopius*² nearly approaches, who, in his *Institutionibus Theologicis*, book I, chapter III, on the question, *Whether there be an idea of Deity implanted or innate in man and in his soul?*, answers on page 6 that “it hardly appears plausible to him: for he believes that it is the condition of the human soul, that not only is no notion naturally impressed upon it, but that also no use of reason is able to hold place in it, except through speech and instruction.” Nevertheless, he adds, “Although there be no innate idea of Deity in man, yet there are some principia given in nature, from which by ratiocination man may be able to gather that there is a God.” That there is not any innate Knowledge of

¹ Krzysztof Ostorodt (c. 1560-1611) was a Polish Socinian. He was sent as a missionary to the Netherlands (1598); in Leiden he stirred up great controversy by his success in converting the students of the University.

² Simon Episcopius (1583-1643) was a Dutch theologian. He studied at the University of Leiden under Jacobus Arminius, and embraced his teacher’s distinctive doctrines. He became a leader among the Remonstrants, playing a significant role at the Synod of Dort (1618).

God in us, CONRAD VORSTIUS¹ also asserts, in his *Exegesi Apologetica*, chapter I: see TRIGLAND'S² *Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen*, volume 4, page 575b.

Πρῶτα ψεύδη, *the fundamental errors*, of the Socinians are:

1. That the Image of God in the first man, or Original Wisdom, is denied, and hence also the relics of that are to be denied in that innate light.

2. That all knowledge of God is from the tradition of the elders, or by faith or revelation, and both by hearing: see *Socinus*, in his *Opera*, tome I, page 537b; *Catechesi Racoviensi* “de Via Salutis”, chapter I, questions 1, 7, 8; and compare the Most Illustrious ARNOLDI'S³ *refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*, on the place cited, § 1-4, 43-45, pages 44, 45, 70, 71, likewise also on chapter I “de Cognitione Dei”, question 4, § 8, page 80.

3. That many Nations are without this light.

The scope/goal; to assert that those six most common heads concerning God, His existence, unity, eternity, perfect righteousness, wisdom, and power, do not belong to natural knowledge, but to revealed, from faith, which things alone are necessary to understand concerning God for salvation; hence that salvation is applicable to the Gentiles also through faith.

Among our men, *Pierre Chauvin*, a Gallo-Belgic Theologian,⁴ in a tractate entitled *de Religione naturali*, published at Rotterdam in 1693 in octavo, part III, chapters I, II, pages 323-339; part I, chapter I, pages 4, 5, contends that natural Law and the knowledge of God are in no one inborn, or inscribed on the hearts of men, but that only the faculty is innate in him, the faculty of acquiring for himself from other sources the knowledge of God as Legislator: see CORNELIUS VAN VELZEN'S⁵ *Continuatam Historiam Ecclesiasticam Spanhemii*, tome 3, pages 653, 654, who enumerates also many others suspected of this opinion.

Objection 1: Things natural are common to all. The knowledge

¹ Conradus Vorstius (1569-1622) was a Dutch Arminian, condemned by the Synod of Dort and banished. It is reported that he openly embraced Socinianism at the end of his life.

² That is, Jacob Trigland the Elder.

³ Nicolaus Arnoldi (1618-1680) was Professor of Theology at Franeker (1651-1680).

⁴ Pierre Chauvin (flourished 1685) was a Reformed Theologian.

⁵ Cornelius van Velzen (1696-1752) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Groningen (1731-1752).

of God is not common to all. Therefore, it is not natural. The *major* is conceded. The truth of the *minor* is evident from Psalm 14:1. *Responses*: 1. The fool *says*, not *believes* and *really thinks*, but *says*, that is, he speaks silently with himself, and tries to persuade himself of this in the time of his folly, when he is plotting evils, although often in vain: he *says*, more with effort than with assent; thus he wishes within, Would that there were no God! Of course, אָמַר, *to say*, is equally made use of concerning a word ἐνδιαιτέω, *residing in the mind*, and one προφορικῶς/*uttered*, and often denotes *to consider*, *to meditate*, comparing with Exodus 2:14, הִלָּחֵרְנוּ אֵתָּה אֲמַר, *sayest/intendest thou to kill us*, especially when the word לֵב/*heart* is added, as it is here: see for example, Genesis 17:17; 27:41; Deuteronomy 8:17; 18:21; 1 Samuel 27:1; Esther 6:6;¹ Psalm 74:8; Ecclesiastes 2:1, 15; indeed, the simple אָמַר, *to say*, is translated a number of times by the Dutch as *to think*, as in Genesis 20:11;² 1 Samuel 16:6; 2 Samuel 21:16;³ 1 Kings 5:5;⁴ etc. Thus the same thing is brought out in Psalm 10:4: *All his thoughts are that there is no God.*⁵ But anyone able to foster thoughts of this sort against natural instinct and common sense, so that he thus suppresses the truth by force through unrighteousness;⁶ such a one is deservedly called a נָכָר/*fool* by the Prophet. 2. It is not intended to be taken so much as a denial of God's Existence, as of His Providence, which is proven by a comparison with Psalm 10; where, in the place of that which was said in *verse 4*, *all his thoughts are that there is no God*, is read in *verse 11*, *he says in his heart, God has forgotten; He hides His face, He never regards it.* Hence also in the Targum of Psalm 14:1, in the place of אֵין אֱלֹהִים, *there is no God*, has לֵית שׁוּלְטָנָא דְּאֱלֹהָא בְּאַרְעָא, *there is no dominion, authority, or power, of God in the earth.* 3. That he does not treat of theoretical Atheists and those

¹ Esther 6:6: "So Haman came in. And the king said unto him, What shall be done unto the man whom the king delighteth to honour? Now Haman thought in his heart (וַיֹּאמֶר הָמָן בְּלִבּוֹ), To whom would the king delight to do honour more than to myself?"

² Genesis 20:11: "And Abraham said, Because I thought (אָמַרְתִּי), Surely the fear of God is not in this place; and they will slay me for my wife's sake."

³ 2 Samuel 21:16: "And Ishbi-benob, which was of the sons of the giant, the weight of whose spear weighed three hundred shekels of brass in weight, he being girded with a new sword, thought (וַיֹּאמֶר) to have slain David."

⁴ 1 Kings 5:5a: "And, behold, I purpose (אָמַר) to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God..."

⁵ Hebrew: אֵין אֱלֹהִים כָּל-מְזֻמּוֹתָיו.

⁶ See Romans 1:18.

properly so called, is proven also from the citation of the words immediately following in *verses* 1-3 in Romans 3:10-12, to prove the universal corruption of the human race: but all the impious and sinners are not able to be called Atheists in the emphatic sense. 4. Finally, if according to *Descartes* we wish to show good sense, we all ought at some point to become *Fools* of this sort; all by universal doubt, even concerning the Existence of God, sooner or later ought *to say in the heart* that *there is no God*: which, nevertheless, the Cartesians also think is easily able to consist with the innate knowledge of God.

Objection 2: What is of faith is not natural to all men. The belief in the Divine Being is of faith, according to Hebrews 11:6. Therefore, it is not natural. *Responses*: 1. In the *Major* there is the fallacy *à dicto secundum quid, from a qualified maxim*.¹ What is of faith alone is not known by nature. But a particular thing may be able to be known partly by Faith, partly by Nature, in a manner of knowing twofold and diverse: to the extent that that is evident by Faith, it is not grasped by natural knowledge. 2. In the *Minor* I would rather have said *the knowledge*, rather than *the belief*, of the Divine Being; and this *Minor* is false, if that knowledge is said to be of *Faith* only or alone. It is evident that Paul here treats of a particular knowledge of divine Existence by faith, which does not overturn the general knowledge by nature, but rather supposes and perfects it, and teaches one to furnish assent to the Existence of God as Triune. In like manner, by nature and faith together we know the immortality of the soul, the necessity of death, the Creation of the world, concerning which it is also spoken here in *verse* 3, *πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ*, etc., *by faith we know that the worlds were framed by the word of God*, etc. 3. Neither ought those things to be separated, which Paul has closely joined; for he speaks of the knowledge of God, by which we please Him, which is only of *faith*. He likewise speaks of faith, by which at one and the same time we firmly believe that God is and that He becomes the *μισθαποδότην*/ *rewarder* of those seeking Him: but there is no knowledge of God as a gracious Rewarder in Christ except by faith.

Objection 3: *Infants are without Theology*. This objection proceeds in the same manner as the first: Natural things are common to all, etc. Now, the *Minor* is confirmed out of the case of infantile age, which is

¹ That is, the fallacy of converse accident, in which an argument is made from a maxim with limitation and qualification to a maxim without such limitation and qualification (ignoring the exceptions).

said to be able to do neither good nor evil,¹ nor to distinguish the right hand from the left,² and so not to know God. *Response*: The knowledge of God is to be regarded either with respect to the faculty, principium, and ability, or with respect to the act: in the former manner it is applicable to infants, with the rationale set forth in § 12, but not in the latter. But that Knowledge deserves to be called Natural to man, no less than speech, reason, etc., which likewise by reason of the faculty and principium are in man immediately from the womb, but with the passing of time at length begin to exert themselves unto act.

Objection 4: Socinus labors to confirm further the same reasoning by the example of whole Nations, discovered in Brasil and other places in India, which are altogether without religion: see, besides his *Prælectiones Theologicas*, chapter II, *opera Fausti Socini*, page 538a, his little book *de Auctoritate Scripturæ*, chapter II, pages 277 and following. *Responses*: 1. This is circular reasoning; for concerning this it is especially controverted, whether such Nations, altogether ignorant of all Deity, be granted. 2. The authority, which is produced to confirm this thesis, is sought only from the negative testimony of a few, who are able to assert nothing other than that they did not discern any vestiges of divine Knowledge or Worship among those Nations, during that time in which they remained among them. But if by a longer and more familiar fellowship with those peoples of which they speak, they had made to themselves both the language and customs more well-known and familiar, they would have experienced something far different: just as others experienced, who concerning the same peoples, whom some have related to be without Divinity, yield to us all other things: see HOORNBEECK'S *Socinianismum confutatum*, book I, chapter VII, tome I, pages 147, 148, where he produces various testimonies, from which it is evident that at least some Worship of Deity, although most corrupt, obtains among the various Nations of America and Occidental India, which springs from an innate sense of divinity. In particular, in the same passage, he relates from chapter XVI of *Historia Navigationis in Brasiliam* of Jean de Léry of Burgundy (who, with other Frenchmen from the Genevan Church, were sent unto America in 1556 for the sake of the preaching of the Gospel, and who discovered a way to Brasil),³ that he made the

¹ See, for example, Isaiah 7:16.

² Jonah 4:11.

³ Jean de Léry (1536-1613), upon his return from his voyage, became a Reformed minister.

Tupinamba Indians of all men the most ignorant concerning God and religion: and yet that there were not wanting even to these some arguments, which indicate that some bit of divinity, although perhaps it be very small, was surviving among them also; especially if you more attentively consider in their case these four things, that they believe in the immortality of the soul; that they recoil in terror from thunder, and ascribe it to a God, although an evil one, *Toupa*; that they complain that they are miserably tormented by a Demon; and finally that they have their own Prophets or Priests, *Caraibes*, who persuade the people that they, because they live in communion with Spirits, furnish courage for them in war against their enemies, and supply fruit, etc. While concerning the *Peruvians*, who were neighboring the *Tupinamba Indians*, *Léry* relates the same thing, that they sacrifice to the Sun and Moon, and some of them also appear to have believed in some manner in the resurrection of the dead. Add HOORNBECK'S *de Conversione Indorum et Gentilium*, book I, chapters V and following, especially chapter IX, in which he treats of the contemporary Gentilism of the Native Americans, and even of the Brazilians and Peruvians, pages 71 and following, likewise book II, chapter XI, page 205: consult also WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 2, Exercise XIII, § 17, but add moreover Exercise XIV, § 26-28. And read even before all for a solution to this Objection JOHANN LUDWIG FABRITIUS'¹ *Apologeticum pro Genere humano contra Atheismi Calumniam*, Opera, pages 119-142.

Objection 5: Finally, they labor to prove by the example of men that are wont to be called *Atheists* that there is no Natural knowledge of the Divine belonging to the human race. To which objection separately,

It may be answered: 1. It is granted that there are a good number of *practical Atheists*, who nevertheless do not deny the Existence of the Divine *theoretically*, indeed, they profess it publicly, Psalm 36:1, 2; Titus 1:16.

2. It is granted that there are those that *indirectly* deny the Divine by the negation of Providence, the Justice of God, etc.; whence by consequence God Himself is denied: nevertheless, concerning these it is not now asked, but concerning those that *directly* cast off all knowledge, belief, and sense of the Divine.

3. It is granted that there are such *by profession of mouth*, who

¹ Johann Ludwig Fabritius (1632-1697) was a Reformed theologian. He served as Professor of Theology, Old Testament, and New at Heidelberg (1661-1696).

deny God, and refuse to acknowledge that they have knowledge of Him: but it is asked whether they sincerely feel this, and have altogether convinced themselves of it; not by doubting temporarily, nor by studiously feigning this ignorance; but by having this opinion firm and fixed within themselves? And this latter appears hardly to be able to be admitted, although one might profess it with the mouth; no more than if one, by feigning Skepticism, should protest that he knows absolutely nothing, that he does not understand the truth of that principium, Nothing is able at the same time to be and not to be; that he has no knowledge of the law of nature, nor experience of an accusing or excusing conscience: for a man of this sort would not be able readily to be reckoned worthy of confidence among those experienced in the affairs of men.

4. Here and there among the Gentiles there were those that repudiated the received Deities, and hence according to the foolish opinion of the common people they were called *Atheists*: but it is enquired concerning those that cast away entirely all sense of the Divine.

5. Formerly all Nations were destitute of the saving knowledge and communion of the true God, and hence they are called ἄθεοι/*atheists* by Paul, Ephesians 2:12,¹ upon which passage consult HENRICUS WILHELMUS VAN MARLE'S *Flosculos in Libros Novi Testamenti Dogmaticos*, in which he discusses the various significations of the word ἄθεος/*atheist* among the Greeks. But, acknowledging just how false Theology can be, we inquire concerning those that are altogether destitute of all Theology. And valid reasons are given for denying a theoretical Atheism of this sort. If we consider, α. those things that were previously set forth in favor of the natural knowledge of God, especially the innate knowledge of God, except with the casting aside of the light of reason itself. β. That thus all the first truths of the soul would be able to be extirpated, which would classify man as non-man, that is, as destitute of reason. γ. That, if all acquaintance with the Divine is able to be cast off, all sense of natural Law is able no less easily to be expunged, and in this manner the ἀναπολογησίαν/*inexcusability* of the Nations² is greatly diminished. δ. The glorious majesty of the

¹ Ephesians 2:12: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God (ἄθεοι/*atheists*) in the world..."

² See Romans 1:20; 2:1.

divine Legislator and Judge is added, to which it is appropriate to supply that all, willingly or unwillingly, are imbued with the knowledge of His ὑπεροχῇ/*pre-eminence*. ε. Consider, moreover, that the Demons do not cast away the acknowledgement of the Divine, in spite of the fact that they tremble at it, James 2:19. ζ. Finally, Paul, describing the incurable malice of the Gentiles, Romans 1, indeed makes mention of their vain rites and gross idolatry, even calls them *haters of God* in verse 30, yet he never accuses them of denying the Existence of God, which in all other respects would have been the very peak of all outrages. On the contrary, even in such malice, says he, they know God and τὸ δικάϊωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the judgment of God*, and have the work of the law written on their hearts, Romans 1:19, 20, 32; 2:14, 15. ζ. Additionally, the Eminent NIEUWENTYT, *Cosmotheoria*, chapter XVI, § 12, pages 280, 281, observes that the continuous efforts of Atheists to fight against natural Theology with all violence reveal the consciousness of Divinity in Atheists; while they would not judge some chimera of a winged horse, a golden mountain, etc., worthy of so laborious a refutation.

But if any, therefore, perhaps be found so wretched, that they had rather be persuaded that there is no God, than that the same exists, this is able to be attributed to the terrible judgment of heaven-sent Blindness; neither does their example prove that the natural knowledge of Deity is not given, any more than the example of the few that are born blind and mentally feeble demonstrates that vision and reason are not natural to man: consult SPANHEIM'S *Decadum Theologicarum* III, § 2, *Opera*, tome 3, column 1205; and an *Anonymous author's Dissertationem pro Legato Stolpiano*, on the question *Quodnam pro adserenda Numinis Existentia pretium statui debeat Consensui communi generis humani?* pages 157-163.

What our AUTHOR adds, "The error of Aristotle, who hardly acknowledges the Creation, is wrongly confounded with Atheism itself by Socinus:" concerning this many more things are able to be found in HOORNBEECK'S *Socinianismo confutato*, book I, chapter VII, section III, tome I, pages 172, 173; and in BUDDEUS' *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter I, § 15, chapter II, § 9, 10, pages 134, 135, 139, 140; chapter VI, § 3. *Algemeene Historie uyt het Engelsch vertaalt*, part I, piece I, Introduction, pages 8, 9.

Concerning Atheism, and against it, more things are discussed by VOETIUS in his *Disputationum theologicarum*, volume I, pages 114-226; also by BUDDEUS in his *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, to which treatise JOHANNES LULOFS added his *Annotationes*, altogether worthy of

reading; *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1379-1385a; and also *Institutionibus Theologiæ Moralis*, part II, chapter III, section 1, § 18, pages 433, 434.

A Scholastic question, whether *it is known of itself that there is a God*, is agitated in the first part of the *Summa*, question 2, article 1, and in *Magistrum Sententiarum*, book I, distinction 3. Thomas distinguishes, that it is indeed known of itself, but not by us. Others simply defend rather that it is known by us. But those acknowledge that the Question is greatly altered in the explication of a proposition *known of itself*, and of the distinction between a thing *known of itself* and *known to us*. Now, they say that that proposition is known of itself, which of itself, not through anything else, is known to us; or to which the intellect furnishes assent, not through another, but through itself alone; or if there be such a proposition that it could not be directly denied, and if its truth be so manifest that everyone immediately judges it to be true, if it be understood what it signifies. HOORNBEECK on this occasion, in his *Socinianismo confutato*, book I, chapter VII, controversy VII, section I, tome I, page 135, thinks that it is proper to distinguish between the *knowledge of a thing*, and the *knowledge of the proposition* that sets forth the thing; and he says that, that there is a God, is *known of itself*, if you regard the thing searched into and its evidence: but, that this thing is able to be set forth in a manner more or less evident; and that hence it is able to happen that the terms, by which this thing, known of itself, is set forth, are not to such an extent known of themselves that we do not hold it necessary to seek a clearer explication of the proposition and of the thing proposed, before giving our assent to the thing proposed.

§ 18: The Object of Natural Theology

With the Existence of Natural Theology asserted, its *Object* in *fallen man* is declared positively and negatively.

α. Natural Theology extends itself, not only to the Existence of God, or *that God is*; but also to His Spiritual Essence, and His Essential Attributes, or *what God is*, for example, wisdom, power, goodness; whence the elogy of *Optimus Maximus* among the Greeks:¹ and, moreover, to the Natural Works of Universal Creation, which we easily perceive has not existed from eternity, neither was it thus produced by chance or by a blind cast; likewise to the Natural Works of Providence, through which we perceive that this world is governed by its author. Through this Theology some Knowledge, although Imperfect, is added, both of the divine Law, and of our Misery; to the extent that we acknowledge that God is to be sincerely worshipped before all, that Justice among men and Temperance in all of life are to be observed; that rewards are to be looked for by the just, punishments by transgressors; that we in as many things as possible are transgressors of the divine Law, are hence liable and obnoxious to divine vengeance, and that this guilt is not to be washed away easily: that, at the same time, by all means Reconciliation with the Deity is to be sought. These things have regard unto τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *what may be known of God*, which God Himself ἐφανερώσε, *has shown*, by nature to every man internally and externally, Romans 1:19.

β. But that Θεοῦ γνωστὸν, *thing known of God*, stops far below those things which are necessary to be known for salvation, and which pertain to τὸ πιστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the thing believed of God*, revealed in the Word of God, especially in the Gospel.

For, Natural Theology does not know, in the first place, *who God is*; that is, by nature after the Fall we do not understand the Trinity of divine Persons; see *Chapter V*, § 28. Matthew 16:17, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψε σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven*: namely, that the Son is in the Deity personally distinct from the Father, yet one with Him in Essence; which Knowledge is nevertheless necessary

¹ Jupiter was sometimes called *Optimus Maximus*, *the Best, the Greatest*.

for salvation; see *Chapter V*, § 29. Hence by Nature after the Fall we are able to be said not undeservedly to be ignorant of the *true God*. Indeed the Most Illustrious VRIESIUS, in his *Exercitationibus rationalibus* IV, § 6, on the Question whether the *true God* might be said to be known from Nature, thinks that it is to be answered affirmatively, since we know God by nature as the Independent Spirit, although naturally we know God *imperfectly* on account of a lack of knowledge of the Trinity: but it is one thing, says he, for knowledge that one has of God to be imperfect and not saving; it is another thing for the object of such imperfect Knowledge not to be the *true God*. It appears to be able to be said with no less right that naturally it is known *that* and *what* God is, or God's Existence and Essence less distinctly, but not *who* God is: but, if we do not know God as Triune, we will then form a false concept of His subsistence. Hence the *true God* is said to be ἄγνωστος/*unknown* to the Gentiles, Acts 17:23, on which passage see LELAND, disputing against Cudworth,¹ in his *de Utilitate et Necessitate Revelationis Christi*, part I, section II, chapter XVIII, pages 506-521. The Gentiles, devoid of revelation, are said hence to have lived in *the times of Ignorance*, Acts 17:30, and *not to have known God*, and hence *to have worshipped those which by nature were not God*, Galatians 4:8; 1 Thessalonians 4:5; τὰ εἰδωλα, *the idols*, which the Gentiles were worshipping, are opposed Θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ, *to the living and true God*:² consult GERARDUS GULIELMUS AB OOSTEN DE BRUYN in *Dissertatione de Philosophia Gentile Doctrinæ moralis*, pages 84-92. SENECA'S *Epistolæ* XLI, "Without God no one is a good man: —In every good man God (*who God is is uncertain*) God dwells." Concerning this matter, CICERO complains, in his *Academicis Questionibus*, book II or IV, chapter XLI, "To Zeno³ and the rest of the Stoics generally the *æther* appears to be the most high God, endowed with reason, by which all things are ruled. Cleanthes,⁴ who is, as it

¹ Ralph Cudworth (1617-1688) studied at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he was elected fellow (1639) and Regius Professor of Hebrew (1645). He was supportive of the Commonwealth, but, after the Restoration, he appears to have had little difficulty accepting appointments in the established church, serving as Vicar of Ashwell, Hertfordshire (1662), and then Prebendary of Gloucester (1678). He was a leader of the Cambridge Platonists.

² 1 Thessalonians 1:9.

³ Zeno of Citium (333-264 BC) was the founder of the philosophical school of Stoicism.

⁴ Cleanthes (c. 330-c. 230 BC) was a pupil of Zeno, and his successor as head

were, a Stoic of elder races, a hearer of Zeno, thinks that the *sun* rules and is master of affairs. And so we are compelled by the dissension of the wise, to be ignorant of *our own ruler*, inasmuch as we do not know whether we are subjects of the Sun or of Æther.”

Likewise Natural Theology does not know *Christ the Mediator*, and the way of the *Reconciliation* of the world with God in Christ, 1 Timothy 3:16; 1 Corinthians 2:6, 7. In addition, it does not know the spiritual *perfection of the Law*, Romans 7:7, and the *rise and magnitude of human Misery*, which are the beginnings of Saving Knowledge and Repentance. Hence man, imbued with Natural Theology alone, is said to be *darkened in understanding*, indeed, to be of the *darkness* itself, Ephesians 4:18; 5:8.

§ 19: The Insufficiency of Natural Theology

With the Object of the Natural Theology of Fallen man having been carefully considered, our AUTHOR rightly concludes that there is an *Adjunct* of this Theology, namely, its *Insufficiency for Salvation*.

For that is proven, 1. from the fact that the Trinity is not known through it. For what Theology does not know God as Triune is not able to be saving to men; compare John 17:3; 1 John 2:23; and *Chapter V*, § 29, below. 2. There is no salvation outside of Christ: Natural Theology does not know Christ: Therefore, it does not lead to salvation; compare John 14:6; Acts 4:12. Again, salvation only occurs through the faith of Christ: Natural Theology is ignorant of the faith of Christ: Therefore, it is without salvation. The Proof of the Major is Mark 16:16; John 3:16, 18.

It ought not *to be taken as an exception*, that this is the *ordinary way* of salvation; but that from this it does not follow that God is not able to confer salvation *extraordinarily* upon those that have lived holily according to the Law of nature, although they be ignorant of Christ. For (as the Most Illustrious TURRETIN rightly says in his *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, *locus I*, *question IV*, § 5), since Christ is according to the Holy Scriptures the only way of salvation, without whom no one comes to the Father; an extraordinary way of salvation without Him is not able to be devised without sin. Consult on this second Argument CALVIN'S *Institutionem Christianæ Religionis*, *book II*, *chapter VI*.

We proceed on the other hand: 3. To what Theology salvation has been removed by divine authority, through this theology one arrives not at salvation. But to natural Theology salvation has been removed, since the Gentiles furnished with it nevertheless are said to be ἄθεοι/*atheists* and ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες, *having no hope*, Ephesians 2:12.¹ 4. Natural Theology must lead to salvation either by the Legal way or the Evangelical way: not by the Evangelical way, because its subject matter

¹ Ephesians 2:12: "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope (ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες), and without God (ἄθεοι/*atheists*) in the world..."

is ignorant of the Gospel and Christ: but not by the Legal way, because for Fallen man there is no salvation by the works of the written Law, much less by the obedience of the less complete natural Law. Paul teaches Jews and Greeks in Romans 3:19, 20 that πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ, καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ· διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας, *every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.* In this, therefore, natural Theology is deficient, that it does not supply sufficient means for attaining unto true salvation; it does not exhibit the means of expiating sins, neither does it indicate whence we might be able to recover strength sufficient for the worship of God.

The Most Illustrious WITSIUS has written elegantly, as is his manner, in his *De Œconomia Fœderum*, book III, chapter V, § 14, “They do not procure assent from us, whether they be the ancients, a catalogue of whom *Casaubon*¹ has composed, in his *Exercitatione I ad Apparatus Annales Baronii*,² and after him *Vossius*, in his *Historia de controversiis, quas Pelagius*, book III, part III, thesis II; or they be the more recent men, that think that by this calling of nature the honest among the gentiles were led to salvation without the knowledge of Christ. And we think that those of our brethren attribute too much to nature, for whom it was agreeable to write: *Men, if they be not willingly blind, are able to acquire through τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, that which may be known of God, *some knowledge of the divine mercy, by which they might pursue salvation, by that method, which perhaps lies hidden, even if that γνώσις/knowledge were destitute of distinct knowledge of some mysteries, which they of themselves were not able to know in any manner: Amyraut’s Specimine Animadversionum in Exercitationes de Gratia Universali*, part II, page 133. For us it is certain that there is no salvation without Christ, Acts 4:12: That there is no communion for those of age with Christ except through faith upon Him, Ephesians 3:17: That there is no faith upon Christ without the knowledge of Him, John 17:3: That

¹ Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) began his career as Professor of Greek at Geneva and finished his career as a prebendary of Westminster and Canterbury. He was a learned critic, and he produced annotated editions of Greek and Latin authors. He was among those that sought a reunion between the Protestant and Roman churches.

² Cesare Baronio (1538-1607) was an Italian Cardinal; he wrote *Annales Ecclesiastici* in twelve folio volumes.

there is no knowledge of Him except through the preaching of the Gospel, Romans 10:14: That there is no preaching of the Gospel in the works of Nature. For the Gospel is that *mystery hidden from times of ages*, Romans 16:25.”

But if Natural Theology were sufficient to acquire Salvation, it would not have been such a great privilege to the Israelites to be blessed with divine Revelation above the Gentiles: but see Psalm 147:19, 20; Romans 3:1, 2.

That the Ethics of the Gentile Philosophers did not furnish the true way of eternal felicity and solid tranquility of mind, teach GERARDUS GULIELMUS AB OOSTEN DE BRUIYN in his *Dissertatione de Philosophia Gentile Doctrinæ moralis*, pages 116-128, 130, 131; and Anonymus in his *Cogitatione de Doctrina Sapientium Gentilium morali*, *ibid.*, § 15-17, 187-190.

§ 20: Vindication of the Insufficiency of Natural Theology

What has thus been said concerning the Insufficiency of Natural Theology for Salvation, our AUTHOR is going to vindicate in the following section.

Some of the Opponents at this point are *Ancients*, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and others cited, as we just now heard from Witsius, in CASAUBON'S *Exercitatione I ad Apparatus Annales Baronii*, chapter I, who were entertaining good hopes concerning the Salvation of the Gentiles and Philosophers that were governing their lives according to reason; who were either not yet sufficiently taught Christian doctrine, or were speaking less carefully before the times of Pelagius. At the same time, CASAUBON, *Exercitatione I ad Apparatus Annales Baronii*, chapter I, pages 3, 4, thinks that the harsher words of CHRYSOSTOM concerning the Knowledge and Faith of Christ before His advent into the world not being necessary for salvation are able to be softened by a comparison with other sayings of this Father, and are explained of a clear, perspicuous, and explicit knowledge and faith of Christ, not of an obscure and enigmatical knowledge wrapped in figures: thus JUSTIN Martyr, concerning whose opinion there is a discussion in *Exercitatione I ad Apparatus Annales Baronii*, chapter I, pages 4, 5, is no less ingeniously excused by BULL, in his *Judicio Ecclesiae catholicae de necessitate credendi, quod Jesus Christus sit Verus Deus*, in the Appendix to chapter VII, § 5, pages 81, 82, where you may read among other things, "When Justin in his Apology, which is called the second, page 83, calls Socrates and Heraclitus¹ Christians, he does not mean that they were Christians simply and perfectly, but only partially; that is, to the extent that they followed the guidance of right reason, they, equally with the Christians, acknowledged and worshipped the one God and father of all, with the idols of the Gentiles spurned; indeed, many things exceptional and agreeable to the Christian religion with respect to good morals, they both taught in their own writings, and to some extent expressed in their

¹ Heraclitus of Ephesus (c. 535-c. 475) was a pre-Socratic Greek philosopher; he is remembered for his teaching that the universe is in constant flux and change.

deeds. Indeed, Justin teaches, that reason which is present in every man is, as it were, the σπέρμα/*seed*, and μέρος/*portion*, τοῦ θείου λόγου, *of the Divine Word or reason*, that is, of Christ, whom, therefore, he calls τὸν πάντα λόγον, *the universal reason*; and that consequently the Gentile Philosophers, that before the advent of Christ conformed their teachings and morals to the norm of that reason implanted within them, were thus far Christians; but that only those are Christians in an absolute sense, that are thoroughly instructed and embrace the divine institution and discipline of universal reason, namely, of Christ Himself, delivered in the Gospel, certainly far more sublime than all human wisdom. —But if anyone should suspect that Justin felt that a man is able by the sole help of native reason to arrive at that knowledge of God, which is sufficient to attain heavenly and eternal life and blessedness, let him hear the same speaking for himself in his *Hortatory Address to the Greeks*, which concludes with these words, page 37, Πανταχόθεν τοίνυν εἰδέναι προσήκει, ὅτι οὐδαμῶς ἑτέρως περὶ Θεοῦ ἢ τῆς ὁρθῆς θεοσεβείας μανθάνειν οἷόν τε ἢ παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν μόνον, τῶν διὰ τῆς θείας ἐπιπνοίας διδασκόντων ὑμᾶς, *From every point of view, therefore, it must be seen that in no other way than only from the prophets who teach us by divine inspiration, is it at all possible to learn anything concerning God and the true religion.* — Similarly are the words of the same expressed in the Epistle to Diognetus:¹ Ἀνθρώπων δὲ οὐδεὶς [τὸν Θεὸν] οὔτε εἶδεν, οὔτε ἐγνώρισεν· ἐπέδειξε δὲ διὰ πίστεως, ἣ μόνῃ Θεὸν ἰδεῖν συγκεχώρηται, *and no man has either seen or recognised [God], but He revealed Himself by faith, whereby alone it is given to see God.*” But on behalf of CLEMENT of Alexandria no excuse is offered by the Authors cited. Nevertheless, see what, both for this and for the remaining Fathers alleged for this opinion by Curcellæus,² MARESIUS sets forth in his *Examine Dissertationis III Curcellæi*, which is *de Necessitate Cognitionis Christi ad Salutem*, Section X, pages 655-663. Especially among the Ancient Heretics the *Pelagians* are here to be noted, who taught a threefold way of Salvation, the Law of nature, the Law of Moses, and the Law of Christ: consult SPANHEIM’S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, Section V, chapter

¹ Although the author of the Epistle to Diognetus is unknown, it has been traditionally attributed to Justin Martyr.

² Etienne de Courcelles (1586-1659) was an Arminian theologian. He studied in Zurich, and later succeeded Simon Episcopius at the Remonstrant seminary in Amsterdam. He was a personal friend of Descartes, and was influential in introducing Cartesian rationalism into Dutch Arminian circles.

VII, § I, *columns* 989-993; TRIGLAND'S¹ *Kerckelycke Geschiedenissen*, volume I, page 47.

The *Libertines* naturally follow in their footsteps, introducing an Indifference of Religion: to this pertains the system of *Edward Herbert*, Baron of Cherbury,² who in books, which he wrote *de Veritate* and *de Causis Errorum*, described all saving Religion by these five fundamental heads, which almost all Paganism granted; 1. that there is a God; 2. that He is to be worshipped, with whatever worship, even Idolatry; 3. that attention was to be given to Virtue and Piety; 4. that there is to be Repentance from sins; 5. that Rewards and Punishments are to be expected after this life. Moreover, he held all faith both in the Scriptures and in Christ as Savior as of no importance: see SPANHEIM'S³ *Elenchum Controversiarum, Opera*, tome 3, column 995; BUDDEUS' *de Atheismo et Superstitione*, chapter I, § 27, pages 105, 106. LELAND, *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, has this *Edward Herbert* as the first of the seventeenth Century Deists among the English, although others thereafter rushed headlong into worse; and he shows in his *Epistolis* I, II, pages 1-60, that the five heads required by Herbert in religion were not duly and appropriately recognized by all Gentiles; that the same are more thoroughly and certainly taught in Revealed Theology; that the same do not suffice for Salvation in the corrupt State of Man; that there is little of importance in these things that Herbert brings forward against particular, Supernatural Revelation; and still less credit is to be given to the heavenly Sign, which he believed to have been given by God in support of the publication of his writings.⁴ That *Charles Blount*,⁵ in his *Religione Laici* and *Oraculis Rationis*, most nearly followed Herbert among the Deists, LELAND shows, considering these writings in *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, epistle IV, pages 76-86.

All *Philosophical Naturalists* admit no Religion beyond the Natural, and contend that those things which Reason dictates concerning God and divine things are sufficient for the salvation and true felicity of

¹ That is, Jacob Trigland the Elder.

² Edward Herbert, Baron of Cherbury (1583-1648), was a soldier, diplomat, and religious philosopher. He is sometimes called the "Father of English Deism".

³ That is, Frederic Spanheim the Younger.

⁴ Herbert, hesitating to publish his *De Veritate*, prayed for clarity, and was answered with a sign, a strange, yet gentle, sound from heaven on a clear day.

⁵ Charles Blount (1654-1693) was an English, "freethinking" philosopher and deist.

man; they reject the authority and divinity of the Sacred Scripture; they deride the mysteries, miracles, and prophecies contained in the Sacred Books: see STAPFER'S *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, pages 881 and following, in which what things he asserts concerning Naturalists he proves chiefly out of the two defenders of Naturalism, Tindal¹ and Anthony Collins.² STAPFER then notes, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 14-17, pages 902-923, the Causes and Occasion of Naturalism: he believes the principal cause to be a false concept of the true revealed Religion, as if by this it is denied that Natural Religion is true and most salutary: which things, nevertheless, are easily conceded concerning Natural Religion viewed in itself; but, that this is not sufficient for fallen man, does not detract anything from this Religion's truth and perfection viewed in itself, but takes its rise from the altered state of man. These things are further confirmed in the refutation of the Hypotheses of Naturalism, which follows in his *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 73-101, pages 923-947, and also afterwards in the Resolution of Objections in § 102-135, pages 947-973.

The Socinians are opposed also, partly directly, when they teach that those, that worship God according to the light of nature as a *certain inner Word*, please Him, and are acceptable, and experience Him as their rewarder, according to Socinus in his *Prælectionibus Theologicis*, chapter II, *opera Fausti Socini*, tome I, page 539a: partly indirectly, when they introduce a common Religion of a very few Heads, so that *there are only these six things absolutely necessary to know for salvation*; to know that God is, that He is one only, that He is eternal, perfectly just, perfectly wise, and all-powerful, according to *Catechesin Racoviensem* "de Cognitione Dei", question 3, pages 25, 26, which thereafter is illustrated and confirmed, questions 4-20, pages 26-31. But, that it is necessary to know *hardly anything* concerning Christ, Socinus says in his *Catechismo, sive Christianæ Religionis Institutione*, *Opera*, tome I, page 653b. But this could appear to be strange, that those that deny natural Theology now are able to be said to affirm its Sufficiency for salvation. But it is to be understood, 1. that not all Socinians deny Acquired natural Theology together with Innate natural

¹ Matthew Tindal (1657-1733) was an English, "freethinking" philosopher and deist; his writings were heavily influential in the early days of the Enlightenment. His *Christianity as Old as the Creation; or, the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature* has been regarded by some as the "Bible" of Deism.

² Anthony Collins (1676-1729) was an English philosopher and deist, intimate friend of John Locke.

Theology: 2. that in the place of natural Theology they substitute Theology handed down from the ancients, and received by them from Revelation; which sort of Theology, received by the ancients, with respect to their argument, differs not from natural Theology, or surpasses not the same, and is truly diverse from Theology revealed in the written Word: consult the passages already cited in § XVII, namely, *Socinus' Prælectionibus Theologicis*, chapter II, *opera Fausti Socini*, tome I, page 537b; and *Catechesi Racoviensi* "de Via Salutis", chapter I, questions 1, 7, 8; and ARNOLDI'S *Refutationem Catecheseos Racovianæ*, on the place cited, § 1-4, 44, 45, pages 44, 45, 70, 71. 3. Socinus says that *in all men there is a distinction between right and wrong*; but he had considered this knowledge to be, as it were, internal revelation also, which is able to subsist without the knowledge of God Himself, asserting: "That right ought to be preferred to wrong, honesty to indecency, is *a certain internal Word of God*, to which the man that yields obedience, yields obedience to God Himself, even if he otherwise thinks or considers that God Himself does not even exist. There is no doubt (he goes on) that he that in this manner yields obedience to God, is also going to be acceptable to Him;" in the place cited, *Prælectione Theologica*, chapter II, *opera Fausti Socini*, tome I, page 539a.

Many *Papists* also contend for the Salvation of the Heathen without the knowledge of Christ, as Abulensis,¹ Durandus,² Vega,³ Soto,⁴ Erasmus, and others. The impious reasoning upon this matter of Cardinal Sfondrati,⁵ from his *Nodo Prædestinationis*, part I, § 2, N^o, XI, is

¹ Alonso Tostado, or Tostatus (c. 1400-1455), was a Spanish, Roman Catholic churchman and scholar. He was trained in philosophy, theology, civil and canon law, Greek, and Hebrew.

² Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (c. 1275-c. 1332) was a French Dominican philosopher and theologian. He lectured and wrote commentaries on Lombard's *Sentences*. In some matters, he differed from the great Dominican theologian, Thomas Aquinas, and became known as the *Doctor Resolutissimus* for his firm adherence to his novel positions.

³ Andreas de Vega (died c. 1560) was a Spanish theologian. He taught at the University of Salamanca, and became a Franciscan Observantine. He defended the Roman doctrine of justification, both in print and at the Council of Trent.

⁴ Dominic Soto (1494-1560) was a Spanish Dominican theologian of great repute. He was called to serve at the Council of Trent, assisting in the composition of its dogmatic formulations.

⁵ Celestino Sfondrati (1644-1696) was an Italian Benedictine theologian and cardinal.

cited by *Philippe Vlaming*,¹ in *Epistle XI, contra David Pierman*, § 3, tome I, pages 308, 309.

Finally, the *Remonstrants*, in the elevating, with all their might, of the integrity of reason in fallen men, are not altogether diverse from the opinion of the Socinians; when either with *Adolph Venator*,² in his *Declaratione sua* and *Apologia contra ministros Dordracenos*, they deny this proposition, that no one is able to be saved who has not been engrafted into Christ through true faith: or with *Arminius* in his *responsis ad articulos XV-XVIII*, in *Arminii tractatibus*, pages 121-130, *Arnoldi Corvinus*³ *contra Tilenum*,⁴ and *Episcopus*, they admit, not immediately but mediately, the Heathen and others to salvation; since they state that by the right use of the Light of Nature the Light of Grace is acquired, and that through grace they are brought to glory.

The *Aim* of the Socinians and Remonstrants in their opinion concerning this controversy is thought to be the Syncretism of the various Religions.

On this subject in § 19, we brought forward out of WITSIUS assertions of even some of Our own men, assertions not at all to be approved. Similar to which is the assertion of *Pierre Chauvin*, a Gallo-Belgic Theologian, in which he contends that *man, if he follows natural light, is able to become a sharer in eternal felicity*, in a tractate *de Religione naturali*, published at Rotterdam in 1693 in octavo, concerning which consult WEISMANN'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Novi Testamenti*, part II, Century XVII, § 29, pages 762-767; and BUDDEUS' *Animadversiones in Petri Chauvini librum de Religione Naturali*, chapter 1, in his *Parergis historico-theologicis*, pages 404-427. Concerning the opinion of *Amyraut* and *Testard*⁵ also on this matter, consult PFAFF'S⁶ *Historiam Formulæ Consensus*

¹ Philippe Louis Verhulst (died 1753) was a Roman Catholic writer.

² Adolf Venator (c. 1570-1618) was an Arminian Pastor of German descent.

³ Johannes Arnoldi Corvinus (c. 1582-1650) was a Dutch Remonstrant pastor and theologian. Having been a student of Arminius, he adopted his views, and in 1610 he signed the Five Articles of Remonstrance. He was deposed in 1619.

⁴ Daniel Tilenus (1563-1633) was a Protestant theologian of the Academy of Sedan. Although initially a Calvinist, he embraced the Arminian teaching, and was embroiled in controversy the rest of his life.

⁵ Paul Testard (1599-1650) was a French Reformed Pastor and Theologian.

⁶ Christoph Matthæus Pfaff (1686-1760) was a German Lutheran Theologian of encyclopedic learning. He was appointed Professor of Theology at Tubingen (1716). Within four years, he became chancellor, and held the post for thirty-six years.

Helveticæ, chapter I, § 3-5; and RIVET'S *Synopsin Doctrinæ Amyraldi et Testardi de Natura et Gratia*, opera, tome 3, pages 828 and following; and also *Acta Synodi Nationalis Alençon*,¹ chapter XV, § 24-26, in which Amyraut and Testard acknowledge that Natural Theology because of the corruption of man is insufficient for salvation, and that no one was ever truly converted by it: indeed, they anathematize those that teach that man is able to be saved without the merits of Christ applied to him; nay more, they concede that man is not able to be led to salvation without some sort of knowledge of the word of Christ also.

The speech of ZWINGLI concerning the Gentiles, which our AUTHOR here indicates, and which he does not wish to approve entirely, is found in *Ulrich Zwingli's Expositione Fidei Christianæ ad Regem Christianum*, in which, when he discusses eternal Life, after the distinguished Saints of the Old and New Testaments have been enumerated, he thus proceeds to address the Christian King, *Opera*, part 2, page 559b, "Here thou shalt see Hercules, Theseus,² Socrates, Aristides,³ Antigonus,⁴ Numa,⁵ Camillus,⁶ the Catos, the Scipios: here, thy predecessors, and thine ancestors, however many have departed hence in faith." Hence he enrolls all those in the community of those in heaven. But, 1. We do not make these words ours. 2. It does not follow from this that according to the opinion of Zwingli natural Theology was sufficient for salvation: but he thought that the merit of Christ is thus to be magnified, together with the mercy of God; since he believed that all of this sort to be saved were saved through Christ, and at the same time he thought that saving grace was communicated to them with the Heroic virtues, which were prominent in various illustrious

¹ The Decrees of the National Synod at Alençon (1637) were moderate, allowing the hypothetical universalism of Amyraut and his followers as harmless, saving the orthodoxy of the Amyraldian party.

² Theseus was the mythical founder of Athens.

³ Aristides (530-468 BC) was an Athenian statesman and general (in the war against the Persians). He was called "the Just", and Herodotus remembers him as "the best and most honourable man in Athens," *Histories*, book 8, section 79.

⁴ Antigonus II Gonats (c. 319-239) was a Macedonian king. He is remembered for his honesty, and his cultivation of philosophy and the arts.

⁵ Numa Pompilius is the legendary second king of Rome, successor to Romulus.

⁶ Marcus Furius Camillus (c. 446-365 BC) was a Roman soldier and statesman. His military victories led to five terms as dictator. He was honored with the title, *the Second Founder of Rome*.

men of Heathenism, and that not without the Deity: whether now that rule, *he that believeth not, shall not be saved*, according to the judgment of Zwingli comes to be restricted, not only to adults, but also to those to whom the Gospel has become known; or he also thinks that faith, in a manner unknown to us, is able to be inscribed or instilled in the heart of the Gentiles by the hand of God, as his opinion, with the Papist Soto, is explained by RIVET in his *Synopsi Doctrinæ Amyraldi*, chapter VIII, *opera*, tome 3, page 848; whence he concludes that the error of Zwingli was not of *right*, but of *fact*: since “he everywhere contends that faith in Christ is necessary, and that no one is saved except through Christ; but he was supposing that to the great men in Heathenism it *was secretly infused*.” This opinion of Zwingli is unfavorably mentioned by ECKHARDUS¹ in his *Fasciculo Controversiarum cum Calvino*, chapter XXII, question 2, pages 649-652. See what things are brought to excuse the same thesis by RUDOLF GWALTHER² in his *Apologia pro Zuinglio et Operibus ejus*, which is prefixed to part I of *operum Zuinglii*; where this thesis is treated of in ε:4, 5, 6: also by WENDELIN³ in his *Exercitationibus theologicis*, tome I, Exercise XXXVIII, pages 572-585. Consult the list of those that oppose us in the assertion of the Insufficiency of Natural Theology for Salvation, in MARESIUS’ *Exegesis Articuli II Confessionis Belgicæ*, § 15-19; PETRUS HOFSTEDE’S⁴ *de Belisarius van den Heer Marmontel beoordeelt*, with a renewed defense of this book made by the Author against many adversaries.

Objection 1: Everything that is able to be known concerning God is evident through Natural Theology, according to Romans 1:19. Responses: 1. He here treats of γινωστέον τοῦ Θεοῦ, *what may be known of God*, not τὸ πιστέον, *what is believed*, which alone is saving. 2. That τὸ γινωστέον τοῦ Θεοῦ, *what may be known of God*, is revealed to the Gentiles by nature, Paul asserts, but not πᾶν Θεοῦ γινωστέον, *all that may be known of God*; that only which is able to be had from the book of nature, but not

¹ Heinrich Eckhard (1580-1624) was a German Lutheran Pastor and Theologian.

² Rudolf Gwalther (1519-1586) was the successor of Heinrich Bullinger (who raised him after the death of his father) as Antistes and Pastor of the Grossmünster in Zurich. He married Zwingli’s daughter, Regula, and did much to protect and preserve the great Reformer’s memory.

³ Marcus Friedrich Wendelin (1584-1652) was a Reformed Theologian and educator. He served as Rector at Zerbst from 1610 to 1652.

⁴ Petrus Hofstede (1716-1803) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and Pastor, serving in Rotterdam.

all that which must be known concerning God for salvation from His word, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Mediator, and of the Redemption merited by Him. 3. Paul restricts that γνωστόν, *thing that may be known*, unto the Power and Divinity of God visible in the works of creation and providence: it is not extended to the knowledge of the Goodwill and Mercy of God in Christ, who is to be embraced through faith, without whom there is no salvation. 4. Paul expressly adds the purpose of this γνωστοῦ φανερωθέντος, *knowledge made manifest*: it is not εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτοὺς, *so that they might be saved*; but only εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους, *so that they might be without excuse*, verse 20.

Objection 2: Men through it are rendered inexcusable, according to Romans 1:20. Response: What is sufficient for inexcusability is not immediately sufficient for salvation, even if it be well used; for more things are required to obtain salvation, than to incur damnation ἀναπολογήτως/*inexcusably*. Whosoever might transgress in one, is made guilty of all, James 2:10; but it is not so that whosoever might do well in one, is righteous in all, or shall be justified for this reason: one sin damns; one virtue does not save, but only the perfect observation of the Law. Thus the Gentiles were rendered altogether inexcusable, inasmuch as in the place of the one true God they were inventing for themselves innumerable gods, and in the place of the Creator were worshipping the creature; nevertheless, although God had to such an extent clearly manifested Himself to them through natural works and benefits, and had inscribed in them the knowledge of His Law and δικαίωματος/*righteousness*;¹ in which manner *all solid pretext or what might also have any pretense* in the neglected acknowledgement and worship of this God is withdrawn: but not therefore is the knowledge and acknowledgement of the one God able to be said absolutely to suffice for salvation; compare James 2:19. False, therefore, is the proposition: The abuse of which renders man inexcusable; its use would have rendered men worthy of excuse, indeed, would have saved.

Neither will you be able to argue more rightly from *this place*: That which renders man inexcusable necessarily implies that all the means of salvation are furnished for man: otherwise a man might object,

¹ Romans 2:26: “Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness (τὰ δικαιώματα, *the precepts*) of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?”

All the means of salvation were not communicated to me. For, 1. man is already *inexcusable* on account of the corruption of nature: 2. he is rendered *more inexcusable* on account of the actual abuse of the light of nature granted to him; and thus *all solid excuse* is taken away from him: 3. but the *pretext*, Thou hast not granted to me all the means of salvation, is an excuse, *not solid* but *vain*: since, *a.* the Gentiles neglected the light of Nature itself, which had been granted to them. *b.* Now, to upright man, in whom this natural Light was shining far more brilliantly, the same had sufficiently revealed the way of salvation: but man is in error, which has run down the powers conceded to him by Creation, and which because of sin requires a means of Reconciliation with God unknown by nature: neither is God required to restore this loss: see MESTREZAT'S¹ *Sermonem ad Romanos* 8:28, *tome 2, pages 264-268.*

Objection 3: That which εἰς μετάνοιαν ἄγει, *leads unto repentance*, leads unto salvation; for the bond between salvation and repentance is sure, Ezekiel 33:11; Acts 11:18. But τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the goodness of God*, was leading the Heathen εἰς μετάνοιαν, *unto repentance*, Romans 2:4. Now, they maintain that by the Benignity of God is understood the more common demonstration of divine Goodness in the daily works of Providence.

Response 1: All *repentance* is not Evangelical and saving; but there is also a certain *Legal* repentance, which is taught by the Law, whether natural or written; whether it be external only, or internal also. Now, since Paul in *chapter 1* had discussed the most grievous sins against God and one's neighbor, with which, against τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *what may be known of God*, and His acknowledged δικαίωμα/*righteousness*, and the Law of God written upon their hearts, according to Romans 2:14, 15, the Gentiles formerly were corrupting themselves; he was now able most aptly to speak concerning Repentance from such sins, unto which the longsuffering Benignity of God was directing them, and obliging them to move; who thus indeed without faith in the Gospel would not obtain eternal salvation, but nevertheless would lessen their inexcusability and condemnation. 2. Ἄγειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, *to lead unto repentance*, here is most certainly not to be understood concerning the very result of *Leading* unto Repentance; but neither does it necessarily

¹ Jean Mestrezat (1592-1657) was a French Reformed Theologian and Parisian Pastor.

say that the *Manuduction* unto the same is sufficient, in such a way that its road and way by every reckoning is open to men: but it aptly denotes a powerful *Motion* and *Impulse*, which sort is in every work of divine Benignity, to obey His Law with abstinence from sins, and to seek His surpassing Grace, although in this the Name of the Mediator be not signified, through which alone is access unto the salvation of God. Thus are there also many things among men, moving them to seek this or that, which nevertheless do not show the way of effectually arriving there. 3. Indeed, our AUTHOR supposes, following Augustine among the Ancients; Estius, à Lapide,¹ Tirinus² among the Papists; Cloppenburg and Cocceius among Our men; likewise Maresius in his *Examine Dissertationis III Curcellæi*, which is *de Necessitate Cognitionis Christi ad Salutem*, Section VII, § 29, 30, in *Defensione Fidei Catholicæ opposita Quaternioni Curcellæi*, pages 629; indeed, following Jonas Schlichting among the very Socinians; that the speech of the Apostle is no longer directed toward the Gentiles, but toward the *Jews*, and treats of supernatural Grace granted to them:

α. On account of the emphasis of the text itself, in which τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *what may be known of God*, leads us back to three distinct terms, in which mention was made of the Benignity of God, χρηστότης/*goodness*, ἀνοχή/*forebearance*, μακροθυμία/*longsuffering*, of which things a πλοῦτος/*abundance* is ascribed to God:³ so that thus Paul speaks of the consummate and most abundant Benignity of God. Which, although it is rightly acknowledged in the common works of Providence, nevertheless is to a far greater degree recognized and ought to be acknowledged in the special revelation of God through the Gospel, even of Promise; which sort formerly was granted to the Jews with the exclusion of other Nations: to which follows in the next place the

¹ Cornelius à Lapide (1567-1637) was a Flemish Jesuit scholar. His talents were employed in the professorship of Hebrew at Louvain, then at Rome. He wrote commentaries covering all the Roman Catholic canon, excepting only Job and the Psalms, developing the four-fold sense of Scripture, while emphasizing the literal. His knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and the commentators that preceded him is remarkable.

² James Tirinus (1580-1636) was a Flemish Jesuit priest. His abilities as a commentator are displayed in his *Commentaria in Sacram Scripturam*.

³ Romans 2:4: “Or despisest thou the riches (τοῦ πλούτου) of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering (τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας); not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?”

Gospel of Fulfillment, announced also to the Jews first of all.

β. On account of those things which immediately preceded in *verses* 1-3. Paul here addresses certain men, indeed men quite different from those whom he had indicated at the end of *chapter* 1; for those were *συνευδοκοῦντες τοῖς πράσσουσι ἄξια θανάτου*, *having pleasure in those doing things worthy of death*; now, on the other hand, he speaks of men *judging* and condemning malefactors. Now, these shall not be Gentiles with respect to the Jews, or Philosophers with respect to the common people, or Judges with respect to the people; but *Jews* with respect to the Gentiles. For they, as the offspring of saints, were harshly condemning the Gentiles as impure and odious to God, from whose community they were shrinking; meanwhile, they were imitating the most indecent deeds of the Gentiles, who had been condemned by themselves. Hence these Jews, through that *illative/inferential* διὸ/*therefore*, are said to be *ἀναπολόγητοι/inexcusable* even more than the Gentiles, for they had met with a grace far greater than did the Gentiles, which grace they were thus indecently despising, as it follows in *verse* 4.

γ. On account of the *σκληροκαρδία*, *hardness of heart*, everywhere attributed to the Jews, and the *ἁμετανοήτω καρδία*, *impenitent heart*, with the invitation, greater and clearer through the Gospel, unto Repentance not preventing, through which they were bringing upon themselves a heavier Judgment, whom the Apostle addresses in *verse* 5, who, if he had not now overtly treated of the Jews in *this chapter*, as of the Gentiles in *chapter* 1, was not able through the method either of a conclusion from premises, or of valid insinuation, to urge in *verses* 9-12, *θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρώτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος*, etc., *tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile, etc.* For otherwise that punishment without the distinction, and the cancellation of *προσωποληψίας/partiality*,¹ and the placing of the Jews before the Greeks in punishment, would hardly have been relevant to the present matter.

δ. Because after the parenthesis concerning the Gentiles in *verses* 14 and 15, the Apostle in *verses* 17-25 addresses not new persons, concerning whom he had not hitherto treated, but the same unto whom

¹ Romans 2:11: "For there is no respect of persons (προσωποληψία) with God."

recently he had delivered words weighty and threatening, saying, Ἴδε σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ, etc., *Behold, thou art called a Jew, etc.*. By which address Paul expressly explains those things that were previously asserted in *verses* 1-3, etc. For those things, σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ, *thou art called a Jew, resting in the Law, etc.*, are referred not more agreeably than to him, who in the same person and in the same number was thus previously addressed, ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων, etc., *O man, whosoever judgest, etc.* And in the following words it is most plain that that condemnation of others is rather declared because of those things which those condemning still do, of which it was treated in *the beginning of the Chapter*.

Objection 4: Whence arises peace of conscience, thence is salvation: for peace of conscience is an aspect of salvation, Romans 14:17. But from natural Theology is peace of conscience; for, in Romans 2:15, the Apostle attributes to *the conscience of Gentiles* the function, not only of accusing, but also of *excusing*, from which tranquility of conscience springs.

Response: The *Major* is true only concerning that peace which is certain, solid, and constant: but thus the *Minor* shall be false; since such peace of conscience comes, not from the Law, but from the Gospel, Romans 5:1. Indeed, peace of this sort does not follow from *cogitations* sometimes *excusing*, sometimes also in other things on the other hand *accusing*. It is one thing to excuse in certain things, or from so much, which the conscience of the Gentiles was doing; it is another thing to excuse in all things and from the whole, which was impossible to that. It is one thing to excuse from the more grievous crimes and comparatively to others even more depraved: it is another thing to grant a certain and constant peace to us, which flows from a sense of the love of God and of our reconciliation with Him, which is not able to be granted in the case of the Heathen.

Objection 5: He that did not leave Himself ἀμάρτυρον, *without a witness*, among the Gentiles, to such an extent that He afforded to them the opportunity of *seeking* and *finding* Him, opened to the Gentiles the way of salvation. But the former is true, and therefore the latter. The *Minor* is proven out of Acts 14:17; 17:25-27, compared with Isaiah 55:6, 7: see Socinus' *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, chapter II, *opera*, tome I, page 538, 539.

Responses: 1. God gave a testimony to the Gentiles of His Existence and Goodness, and other Attributes, disclosing Himself in the

works of Nature; but not of His counsel concerning salvation. Hence, 2. to such an extent He was able to be sought and found by the Gentiles, but by this manifestation of Himself God did not open to the Gentiles the way unto His gracious and glorious communion. For, although it be said in Proverbs 8:17, 35, *those diligently seeking me find me; whosoever finds me finds life, etc.*; and what things are similar; it is to be understood that the signification of the words varies according to the circumstances of the passages: hence that the natural seeking and finding of God the Creator and Preserver differs far from the Evangelical seeking and finding of God reconciled in Christ.

Upon § 19 and 20 consult MARESIUS in his *Examine Dissertationis III Curcellæi*, which is *de Necessitate Cognitionis Christi ad Salutem*, in *Maresii Defensione Fidei Catholicæ opposita Quaternioni Curcellæi*, pages 567-665. Also PFANNER¹ in his *Systemate theologiæ gentilis purioris*, chapter XXII, which is *de Salute Gentilium*.

Upon § 19 and 20 consult JOHANN HEINRICH HEIDEGGER'S² *Elenchum Religionis communis salvificæ duabus dissertationibus*, which are found after the *Exercitationes Biblicas* of the same, pages 1-59.

¹ Tobias Pfanner (1641-1716) was a German Lutheran theologian, and served as secretary of the archives to the duke of Saxe Gotha.

² Johann Heinrich Heidegger (1633-1698) was a Swiss Reformed theologian, serving as Professor of Theology at Steinfurt (1659-1665), and then at Zurich (1667-1698).

§ 21: Natural and Revealed Theology Compared and Contrasted

Our AUTHOR briefly in § 21 explains Natural Theology's Agreement with, and Difference from, Revealed Theology; as the former is to be held, both against *Baruch Spinoza*, whose theses these are, *Tractatu Theologico-Politico*, chapter XV, "1. Neither is Theology ancillary to reason, nor reason to Theology. 2. Scripture does not teach philosophical matters, but piety alone; and all things that are contained in it are accommodated to the capacity and preconceived opinions of the vulgar. So that he who desires to accommodate it to Philosophy, ascribes to the Prophets many things that they did not ponder through dreams, and interprets their mind incorrectly. Again, he who on the other hand makes reason and Philosophy a handmaid to Theology, is constrained to admit the the ancient common people's prejudices as divine things." Now, in *chapters* VII and XIV he had already written: "Between faith or Theology and Philosophy there is no commerce and no affinity, of which no one is able to be ignorant that knows both the scope and the foundation of these two faculties, which evidently differ by the space of the whole heavens. For the scope of Philosophy is nothing but truth; but the scope of Faith is nothing but obedience and piety. So that faith concedes to everyone the greatest liberty to philosophize, so that whatever he wills he is able to think concerning whatever things without sin." And against the less congruous expressions of those that smack of *Descartes*. That is, to these belonged the theses defended at Leiden in 1671, "That no prerogative is able to belong to Faith above Philosophy. That some maintain that Philosophy is Christian, no less against reason, than if they should call it Mohammadan. That All Philosophy is free from religion and completely Pagan," with SPANHEIM¹ relating them in an *Epistola de novissimis in Belgio dissidiis*, page 61: following this, on January 16, 1676, the Curators of Leiden University ruled that this thesis, among others, was to be proscribed, that *All Philosophy is free from Religion*: which thesis of the Most Illustrious Craanen,² derived from a companion thesis, "that Philosophy and Faith differ by the space of the

¹ That is, Frederic Spanheim the Younger.

² Theodor Craanen (1633-1688) was a German Mathematician and Physician.

whole heavens, to such an extent that the one is not able to be said to be *ancillary* to the other without absurdity;" in what manner HEIDANUS attempts to excuse this, see in his *Considerationibus, etc.*, pages 87-89. Those maxims are well known, by which RÖELLIUS advances Reason: "Reason is to be held as an Oracle of God (even in the sinner), and whatever it teaches and dictates is to be received as the word of God Himself with a compliant and humble spirit. The Philosopher with the whole authority of Scripture and the certainty of reason, always considering that truth is not contrary to truth, granting that he philosophizes securely, and otherwise sleeps at ease upon either ear,¹ etc.": see *Judicium Ecclesiasticum laudatum*, chapter II, § 3, 5. Add what things out of WITTICH'S² *Theologia Pacifica* VAN MASTRICHT cites in his *Gangræna Novitatum Cartesianarum*, prior Section, chapter III, § 3, page 36, who, in chapter IV, § 1, 2, pages 50-52, relates that everywhere by the followers of Descartes *Reason and Philosophy are established as certain, revealed, and divine, just like Theology*, with their skillfully expressed words set forth.

DESCARTES himself was sometimes writing more prudently, *Principiorum Philosophiæ*, part I, article 76, "Now, besides these things, it is to be fixed in our memory as the highest rule, that those things that have been revealed to us by God are to be believed as the most certain of all: and that, although perhaps the light of reason, as clear and evident as possible, appear to suggest to us something else, faith is to be applied to divine authority alone, rather than to our own judgment." Assertions of the opposite sort, which so much exalt human Reason even in fallen man, and equate its certitude to Revelation itself, are very dangerous in Theology, especially when with the Socinians there is dispute concerning the mysteries revealed to faith: for they state that those are repugnant to the natural light of reason, which is as certain and evident as the light of revelation; and that hence the Sacred Scripture is to be explained in a sense of that sort, which is not repugnant to reason: thus indeed OSTORODUS in his *Institutionibus*, chapter VI, page 43, "We speak the truth, which reason attests to us, and that as evidently and clearly as the sun shines at noonday, that it is impossible, and therefore false, that two

¹ Terrence's *The Self-Tormentor*, act 2, scene 2, line 101. It is a proverbial expression denoting a resting in security.

² Christoph Wittich (1625-1687) was a Dutch Theologian and Cartesian. He served as Professor of Theology at Duisburg (1653-1654), Nijmegen (1655-1671), and Leiden (1671-1687).

natures are found in Christ.” But, just as he that distinguishes well teaches well; so also our AUTHOR, by rightly distinguishing those things that are here able to come into controversy, sets all in order, and in a few words embraces all things which were prolixly rehearsed by the Most Illustrious VAN MASTRICHT, *Gangræna Novitatum Cartesianarum*, section I, chapters III, IV, pages 34-62, and the Most Illustrious LEYDEKKER, *Face Veritatis*, locus I, controversies IV, V, pages 15-23, whom I would wish to be consulted.

That is, *Natural Theology is not repugnant to Revealed Theology in the Abstract*, although Natural Theology is far less complete, and takes a position beneath Revealed Theology. Nevertheless, both are *Lights*, Natural Theology the *lesser*, Revealed Theology the *greater*, which have their origin *from the same Father of lights*.¹ Neither is natural truth able to be inconsistent with revealed truth, since *truth harmonizes with truth*, or truth does not contradict truth, as it is in the Axiom; indeed, truth is opposed, not to truth, but to falsehood, although the same truth often becomes known from diverse starting points: thus, that God created the world, is evident by reason and by faith, in Philosophy from the light of nature, in Theology from the light of Scripture. Consult Reverend STAPFER, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome 2, chapter X, § 75-84, pages 924-935.

But Natural Theology nowhere exists in the abstract, as, on the other hand, *Revealed Theology*, pure and *clear of all defects*, is able to be read in the *Sacred Scriptures*. When, therefore, any dispute occurs between them, *Natural Theology with all Philosophy ought to yield to Revealed Theology as more certain*, seeing that human corruption easily mingles itself with Natural Theology. Consult SPANHEMIUS, *Elencho Controversiarum*, Opera, tome 3, column 1001, number 12.

Hence, *from antiquity, on account of that subjection, and the uses which Philosophy additionally furnishes for Theology*, Philosophy was called the *Handmaid of Theology*, being compared with Hagar, as Revealed Theology with Sarah;² and thus according to the doctrine of CLEMENT of Alexandria, *Stromata*, book I, pages 284, 285, “Let Philosophy submit itself to Theology, as Hagar to Sarah;³ let it allow itself to be admonished and corrected; but if it be not subject, cast out the handmaid.”⁴ Consult

¹ See Genesis 1:16; James 1:17.

² Genesis 16:1.

³ Genesis 16:9.

⁴ Genesis 21:10.

LEYDEKKER, *Face Veritatis*, locus I, controversies V, § 12, page 20. TURRETIN, *Theologiæ Elencticæ*, locus I, question VI, § 8, not incorrectly states: "If Theology appropriates certain things from other disciplines, it asks as a superior from inferiors, as a mistress, who freely makes use of her handmaids; and it does not so appropriate from other disciplines that it presupposes certain things, upon which it builds revelation."

So that the concord between Reason and Revelation might be evident, and the subordination of the former to the latter, these cautions are able to be set down:

1. What is true in Philosophy, Theology does not overturn, but receives it, either simply, or with some distinction and limitation: for example, the Philosopher says, Man consists of a rational soul and a body: Theology receives this simply. The Philosopher says, From nothing comes nothing: Theology says the same, but with a limitation added, From nothing nothing comes by a finite, natural agent. The Philosopher says, A virgin does not bear: Theology acknowledges the same, but with this limitation: she does not bear by reason of intercourse with a man; but she is able to bear extraordinarily, by the miraculous power of God.

2. Philosophy judges of matters under the purview of the senses, pronounces nothing of matters unknown one way or the other; for example, concerning these truths Philosophy does not judge, whether a man is true God; whether in one divine Essence there are three persons.

3. What is true to the Philosopher is able to be false in Theology, because his Philosophy is able to be Pseudo-philosophy. Thus, to some Philosophers of the Gentiles it was truth that the World is eternal; which is false Theologically, indeed even Philosophically. For it was an error of those Philosophers, which ought to be imputed to Philosophy no further than the faults of artisans to their art. But, as wine, good in itself, easily contracts something of corruption from the fetid vessel into which it is poured; so Reason and Natural Theology easily attract something of error from corrupt man, in whom it dwells.

4. A truth in Philosophy is able to be false in Theology, and vice versa; through circumstance, because of a perverse application, or *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*, a *shifting unto another relation*. Thus substance is said to subsist in the accidents: this is true concerning all created substance; but, if you think it of God, it is false.

For an illustration of those things, which have here been said,

what things occur below in § 32, and in Chapter II, § 22 and 40, shall be helpful.

§ 22: The End of Natural Theology

With respect to the *End* of Natural Theology:

α. Negatively, it is not the *Salvation* of fallen man, which is proven from its *Insufficiency*, demonstrated in § 19, 20. But,

β. Positively, it is various, *a. With respect to God, a demonstration of His Infinite Goodness*, Psalm 145:9; Acts 14:17: *b. With respect to men,*

1. As far as the *Elect* are concerned, *an easier Leading unto Faith, and a more abundant Confirmation in it.* For those that cleave to the false worship of the Gods are best convinced at first as guilty of vain superstition through Natural Theology, and thus are freed from the false prejudices; in which having been imbued, they tenaciously cleave to ancestral errors, neither do they make room for the better wisdom revealed; in which manner Paul was dealing with the Athenians.¹ Then, the very suffrage of right reason is not a little able to confirm the infirm souls of the faithful, in immovable assent of the truth revealed from heaven. 2. As far as the *Reprobates* are concerned, their Conviction and greater ἀναπολογησία/*inexcusability*, Romans 1:20; τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἢ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους, *for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse, in which the εἰς, so that, is ἐκβατικὸν, expressive of result or event, and τελικὸν, expressive of purpose or end, at the same time.* 3. Finally, as far as Reprobates and Elect together are concerned, especially before the Calling of the latter, Natural Theology is serviceable for greater *Restraint*, that it might be a fetter of external discipline among men, lest the world descend into brigandage; compare Romans 2:14, 15. For, if Sacred Scripture alone reproved vices, men might more easily resist; now, when nature on its part does the same, they are more greatly deterred from them.

¹ Acts 17:16-34.

§ 23: The Necessity of Revealed Theology

We pass to the *Revealed* Theology of the Race-course, the *Necessity* of which is here set first.

That Revealed Theology is Necessary for the Salvation of Fallen man, 1. is proven of itself from the *Insufficiency* of Natural Theology, demonstrated in § 19, 20. 2. That Necessity is also taught by our irrefragable obligation to worship God, even in such a manner, as it is only right, that our worship corresponds to the divine majesty as well as to the divine will; and by the most ardent desire of all, by which every man wishes to be well, in this life and well as in the next. For, that unto neither of these is the way opened to man without divine Revelation, is sufficiently evident from this, that in the searching out and pursuing of both all the wisemen of all Nations and ages labored in vain. So that the Necessity of Revelation might be proven against the *Naturalist*, STAPFER, *Theologicæ polemicæ*, tome I, chapter III, section 10, § 836, teaches that it is not necessary that we dispute subtly and with many words whether it be possible for the Law of Nature to be perfectly answerable, or not? the former of which at least is not able to be proven by the example of other men, inasmuch as we do not have all of their actions, external as well as internal, thoroughly viewed. But the appeal for a decision takes into consideration the Conscience of our very Opponent, which shall give its imperfection as evidence; and universal experience, which declares that the entire human race lies buried under innumerable vices, by which offense is committed against natural Law. With which posited, the question to be agitated with the Naturalist shall be resolved into two. *First*, whether Vindictive Justice be an Attribute of God absolutely necessary, and the Punishment of Sin indispensable? *Second*, whether through Philosophy some means might be found, by which the pain of Conscience might be able to be quieted, and by which a man, freed from Punishment, might be able to be restored unto a perfect state? If the negation of the latter and affirmation of the former be demonstrated, the Necessity of Revelation is also able to be demonstrated, or thence this shall be plain of itself; since without Revelation there is no certain Consolation for a disturbed conscience, no knowledge of a Religion befitting man as sinner or of services to be

rendered by man as sinner toward God as Redeemer: which things at greater length are deduced and proven by STAPFER, *Theologicæ polemice*, tome I, chapter III, sections 11, 12, § 881-994. 3. The Gentiles acknowledged this Necessity in their seeking out of the responses of Oracles and feigned Revelations of the gods, especially when they were devising new religious rites. The Most Illustrious PICTET, *Theologia Christiana*, book I, chapter 3, § I, says, "Those that were inventing new religious rites among them would not have held it as necessary to feign interviews with the gods, like Lycurgus with Apollo,¹ Minos with Jove,² Numa with Ægeria,³ Zamolxis with Vesta,⁴ Charondas with Saturn,⁵ Solon and Draco with Minerva;⁶ unless they had been persuaded that the correct method of worshipping deity depends upon the revelation of that." Muhammad imitated this in his feigned interviews with Gabriel. For the *Necessity of Revelation*, consult also what things are vigorously related by SPANHEIM in his *Decadum Theologicarum*, prima, § 5, opera, tome 3, column 1199; and by BUDDEUS in his *Elementis Philosophiæ practicæ*, part I, chapter VI, § 48-65, pages 189-195: but also what things are more copiously treated in various dissertations, opposed to *Tindal's Christianity as Old as the Creation*, in which book this Deist contends that external Revelation is not at all necessary or useful, and that all presumption of that is the work of Enthusiasm and imposture; with him leaning upon these two false principles, 1. that natural Law or Religion, obliging all men, and containing whatsoever they ought to know, to believe, and to do in whatever state, was from the beginning absolutely perfect and immutable, to such an extent that thereafter nothing was able to be

¹ Lycurgus (c. 820-730 BC) was the legendary lawgiver of Sparta, establishing its military-oriented society. According to legend, his reforms were confirmed by the oracle at Delphi.

² In Greek mythology, Minos was the king of Knossos three generations before the Trojan War. He received the legislation for the island from Zeus.

³ Numa was the legendary second king of Rome, author of many important Roman political and religious institutions. He is said to have had a relationship with the nymph Ægeria, receiving from her the wisdom to legislate skillfully.

⁴ Zalmoxis was a deity and legendary religious reformer of the Getæ (an ancient people of Thrace), teaching them a doctrine of immortality. He is said to have received his laws from Vesta.

⁵ Charondas (probably to be associated with the sixth century BC) was the lawgiver of Catania, Sicily, delivering his body of laws in the name of Saturn.

⁶ Solon (c. 638-558 BC) and Draco (c. seventh century BC) were Athenian lawgivers, issuing their laws in the name of Minerva.

added to it by subsequent Revelation. 2. That the same Law and Religion of nature also always remained, and is also now, perfect and clear to every man, to such an extent that by no external Revelation is it able to be rendered clearer to any, as without that external Revelation it pertains to all men: see LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, missive 8, pages 187-225. To which add what things are taught by LELAND in *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 1, missive 14, pages 450-479, against the writing which was published in 1746, under the title, *Deismus recte propositus et plene assertus*. Similarly, the Necessity of Revelation against Bolingbroke¹ LELAND teaches in *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten*, tome 2, part 2, missive 10, pages 353-405, from the necessity of a more abundant and certain knowledge than reason supplies to fallen man, 1. of the Unity of God, of the essential Perfections of God and of divine Providence: 2. of the acceptable manner of the religious worship of God: 3. of the moral Duties to be rendered toward God, ourselves, and the neighbor, Duties considered in all their extent: 4. of the nature of the Highest Good and of true Blessedness: 5. of the certain means of the Reconciliation of sinful man with God: 6. of the rewards and punishments to be expected after this life. That supernatural Revelation is not only *possible*, but also in the present state of the human race *useful in the highest degree*, indeed also *absolutely necessary*, the same LELAND shows in his *Inleidende Verhandeling voor de Nuttigheid en Noodzakelykheid van de Christelyke Openbaring*, section II, pages 22-55, who powerfully confirms in many words this Utility and Necessity of Revelation successively through that entire work. The *Naturalists*, denying the Necessity of Revelation, and those on the other hand that have asserted the Necessity of the same, are also recorded by BUDDEUS in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 10, tome 2, pages 1385-1390.

A *vague hope* of that sort of *Revealed Theology* one may derive from the *Goodness of God*, who, since He has in man distributed a Desire to enjoy the highest Good, is not to be thought to have made that in all men completely in vain; but rather to have willed to lead at least some unto the knowledge of the highest Good, and the way by which they might be able to arrive at the enjoyment of the same.

But to prove the *Truth* of Revealed Theology pertains to *Chapter*

¹ Henry St. John, First Viscount of Bolingbroke (1678-1751), was an English government official and political philosopher. In spite of his Deism, he was a proponent of conformity and a supporter of the Church of England.

2, concerning *Holy Scripture*, and is accomplished by the same arguments, in which the divine origin of the Scriptures is apparent. TERTULLIAN, *Apologetico*, chapter XVIII, “So that we might address more fully and impressively both Him, and His dispositions and will, we have added the Testament of literature, if one should desire to seek God, and to find the *inquisito*, *One sought*, and to believe upon the One found, and to serve the One believed.” In the place of *inquisito*,¹ others read *inquisitum*.²

For the more abundant illustration and confirmation of this §, consult PETRUS DINANT,³ *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter I, pages 1-117, in which also Criteria are proposed, by which true Revelation might be able to be distinguished from false Revelation; HENDRIK LUSSING Matthysz, *de Noodzekelykheid van den Godtsdienst*, etc., part I, discussion V, chapters I-III, pages 393-448.

¹ In the Dative case.

² In the Accusative case. The verb, *invenire*, *to find*, normally takes an Accusative object.

³ Petrus Dinant (1663-1724) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian.

§ 24: Habitual Revealed Theology

This Revealed Theology is distinguished according to the various aspects of the same. For, either it is in a man *habitually*, according to the manner of a habit residing in the man as Theologian and his intellect, which is also called *Practical* and *concretive* and *subjective*: or it is *systematic*, just as it is contained in Systems, according to the manner of any discipline arranged in its own, prescribed and fixed method, which also is called *Doctrinal* and *abstract* and *objective*.

Now, that *Habit* of Practical Theology is *Supernatural*, rather than natural, because it is *acquired*, 1. *from a revealed principium*; not from the natural manifestation of God through the Creatures, but from the special and gracious Revelation through the Word. 2. Human reason is not sufficient to learn this Theology, if the knowledge of it is going to be saving; but that habit is acquired from the *teacher*, the *Holy Spirit*, although a man's own industry is involved.

But now the problematic Question is moved, whether the *Genus* of this Revealed Theology is able to be taken from the Intellectual Habits enumerated by Aristotle? It is well known that *Aristotle*, in his *Ethics*, book VI, chapter III, posits five intellectual Habits, which he sets forth in chapters IV-VII: now, those are either more theoretical, like Intelligence, Science, Wisdom: or more practical, and the latter either active, under which are comprehended the practical disciplines, and is called *Prudence*; or factive,¹ under which are contained *Arts*. But Philosophers of the more recent age observe, 1. that Intelligence, as it denotes the knowledge of first principles implanted in the mind, is not able to be referred unto acquired habits; 2. that there is no Science that does not have at one and the same time its own principia and conclusions; 3. that Wisdom, although it be called a more sublime degree of Science and Intelligence, does not constitute a diverse Habit, for degrees do not change the species. And therefore they enumerate a threefold intellectual habit, according to the threefold *object*, concerning which, so that a man might direct his actions well, he needs a certain facility, that is, theoretical, practical, effective: and they think that concerning the first a man is helped by the habit of *Science*, concerning the second by the habit of *Prudence*, concerning the third by the habit of *Art*. But this in

¹ That is, *making* or *creating*.

passing.

Now, as far as those Aristotelian Habits are concerned, we say that none of them is able to constitute the *Genus* of habitual Theology, for, 1. a genus and its species are homogeneous among themselves: but the Aristotelian *habits* are *natural*, while revealed Theology is *supernatural*. 2. A genus ought not to be narrower than its species: but the Aristotelian habits, taken separately, are narrower than Theology; therefore, they are not its Genus. Of course, all those habits are *simple*, either theoretical, or practical: but Theology is a habit *composed* of the theoretical and practical.

With regard to species, Revealed Theology is not properly *Intelligence*, or a knowledge of Principia, to which Principia we spontaneously give assent without demonstration, for, 1. Theology is a knowledge both of principia, and of conclusions, that is, equally of the Word itself and of the doctrines that are thence derived, 2 Timothy 3:16; Acts 26:22. 2. Intelligence is conversant about principia known by nature and by their own clear light, Theology about principia revealed by the Word of God.

It is not properly *Science*, which is said to be a knowledge of Conclusions, to which we give assent by demonstration: 1. For Theology does not depend upon the evidence of reason, but upon divine testimony and the authority of the one revealing. Hence, in Theology, we do not so much *know* by demonstration, but we *believe*, or learn by faith, Hebrews 11:3. 2. Theology does not rest in the understanding, but directs it unto practice.

Now, to Aristotle *Wisdom* is the knowledge of principia and conclusions at the same time: but, if Theology is neither Intelligence or the knowledge of principia, nor Science or the knowledge of conclusions; then neither is it Wisdom or the knowledge of both.

It is not *Prudence*, which is conversant with τὰ πρακτικά, *things practical*, of which there is no other end besides εὐπραγίαν/*success*: for Theology is a habit, not only of things to be done, but also of things to be believed, John 20:31; and it direct actions spiritual, not civil.

And, finally, it is not properly *Art*, which is conversant with ποιητὰ, *things made, things to be produced*, which are produced outside of the one producing on account of some end, and beyond εὐπραγίαν/*success* have another, further end, by which very thing ποίησις/*production/fabrication* is distinguished from πράξει/*practice*. But, 1. Theology, as already mentioned, also involves things to be believed. 2.

Art is said to be of those things that are terminated in some work outside of the producer: but Theology is of those things that also are terminated in the producer himself; in such a way that we know, meditate, believe, exult, hope, Romans 5; 8. Therefore, etc.

At the same time, when these words are not taken strictly, Theology is able to be said to embrace in itself all these habits *eminently*; and it hardly deserves to be called into controversy whether the *Genus* of *Science* on account of *certitude*, or of *Wisdom* on account of *sublimity*, or *Prudence* on account of the *directing of behavior*, ought rather to be attributed to that. For those words always ought to be taken synecdochically, in such a way that one also embraces the other in itself. But in this way *Intelligence* also is agreeable to Theology on account of its most eminent knowledge of first principles, namely, of being, which is God, and of knowing, which is the Word of God: and also *Art*, to the extent that it is edifying to the Church. Thus, for example, *Intelligence* occurs in Psalm 119:27, 34, when the Psalmist prays *הַבִּינֵנִי*, *make me to understand*;¹ it is called *בִּינָה* / *Intelligence* and *חָכְמָה* / *Wisdom* in Proverbs 1:2.² *Science* is called *דַּעַת* in Psalm 119:66,³ *γνῶσις* in 2 Peter 3:18;⁴ *Wisdom* is called *σοφία* in 1 Corinthians 2:6, 7;⁵ James 3:17.⁶ *Prudence*, *מְזֻמָּה*, is found together with *Science*, *Wisdom*, and *Intelligence*, *תְּבוּנָה*, in Proverbs 2:10, 11,⁷ and elsewhere. Just as also Theology is considered *Art*, when the Church is found after the likeness of a work or edifice, to be perfected more and more through Theology, which also has its own

¹ Psalm 119:27, 34: “Make me to understand (*הַבִּינֵנִי*) the way of thy precepts: so shall I talk of thy wondrous works.... Give me understanding (*הַבִּינֵנִי*), and I shall keep thy law; yea, I shall observe it with my whole heart.”

² Proverbs 1:2: “To know wisdom (*חָכְמָה*) and instruction; to perceive the words of understanding (*בִּינָה*)...”

³ Psalm 119:66: “Teach me good judgment and knowledge (*דַּעַת*): for I have believed thy commandments.”

⁴ 2 Peter 3:18a: “But grow in grace, and in the knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

⁵ 1 Corinthians 2:6, 7: “Howbeit we speak wisdom (*σοφίαν*) among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom (*σοφίαν*) of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought: But we speak the wisdom (*σοφίαν*) of God in a mystery, even the hidden, which God ordained before the world unto our glory...”

⁶ James 3:17a: “But the wisdom (*ἡ—σοφία*) that is from above is first pure...”

⁷ Proverbs 2:10, 11: “When wisdom (*חָכְמָה*) entereth into thine heart, and knowledge (*דַּעַת*) is pleasant unto thy soul; Discretion (*מְזֻמָּה*) shall preserve thee, understanding (*תְּבוּנָה*) shall keep thee...”

doctrines more or less foundational, Ephesians 2:20, 21; 1 Corinthians 3:11, 12; and when from that Theology we are compelled to learn the most salubrious Art of furnishing good works, Titus 3:8.

§ 25: Systematic Revealed Theology

Theology Doctrinal, or considered *systematically*, is not taken here very strictly, as it is done in the writings of the Fathers, for the Doctrine of God and of the Holy Trinity, or of the divine nature of Christ, as over against *Economy* or doctrine of the dispensation of the *Incarnation*, the human nature of Christ, and the *connected benefit of Redemption*; just as we saw in § 2: but Theology here comprehends under itself *all revealed Doctrine concerning God and divine things*.

It is divided again in a variety of ways, either with respect to *Parts*, or according to the diverse *Mode* of delivery.

With respect to *Parts*, it is either *Exegetical*, which is conversant with ἐξηγήσει/*exegesis* or the explication of the text of Sacred Scripture and argues concerning the sense of this or that passage: or *Didactic*, which διδάσκει, teaches, passes on, and builds Theological truths and dogmas: *Elenctic* or *Polemical*, which, taken strictly, is conversant with questions of a more Fundamental character with Adversaries, and takes pains with the *refutation* and *vanquishing* of their Errors, from ἐλέγχειν/*elenchein*, to *refute*, and πόλεμος/*polemos*/war: or again *Casuistic*, which sets forth *Cases of Conscience*, and answers them: *Patristic*, which from the writing of the Fathers, who flourished in the first ages of Christianity, describes their opinions concerning whatever Theological dogmas: *Problematic*, which reflects upon whatever Questions that do not so much touch the foundation, but concerning which it is able to be argued either way by a saved, orthodox believer: *Historical*, which divides and describes the doctrine of religion, and its circumstances, according to the various ages of the Church, so that in this way one might be able to be certain concerning the perpetual preservation of the true doctrine and succession of the true Church; that is, this Theology relates the origin, propagation, perversion, and restoration of Theological doctrine by its individual heads from monuments worthy of credit. Nevertheless, some of these parts of Theology are able to be comprehended under others, and the first place among them is held by *Didactic* and *Elenctic Theology*, which are not so aptly separated from one another; but it is optimally conducive to the implanting of the knowledge of the sacred Science, if, immediately after the solid confirmation of individual heads of doctrine, a succinct refutation of the opposite error is delivered. Be that as it may,

those various parts of Theology, just now enumerated, treated separately, are able to be considered in the writings of JOHANN HEINRICH ALSTED,¹ HEINRICH ALTING, etc. Biblical observations upon the whole of Sacred Scripture, under the title of *Theologiæ Exegeticæ*, were published in two folio volumes by PHILIPP HEINRICH FRIEDLIEB,² in which he considers again and again the same seven Classes of Observations upon individual books of Sacred Scripture, or larger pericopes of them: namely, the first, of Hebraisms in the Old and Hellenisms in the New Testament; the second, of contradictions resolved; the third, of exceptions; the fourth, of objections; the fifth, of proverbs; the sixth, of circumstances, persons, places, and times; the seventh, of questions. JOHANN FRANZ BUDDEUS, in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, weaves together a most ample history of these various Parts of Theology, namely, of Dogmatic Theology, chapter I, tome I, pages 335-438; of Symbolic Theology, chapter II, tome I, pages 438-534; of Patristic Theology, chapter III, tome I, pages 534-610; of Moral Theology, chapter IV, tome I, pages 610-730; of Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence, chapter V, tome 2, pages 733-863; of Polemical Theology, chapter VII, tome 2, pages 963-1426; of Exegetical Theology, chapter VIII, tome 2, pages 1427-1796; and also Ecclesiastical History or Historical Theology, chapter VI, tome 2, pages 863-962.

With respect to the *Mode of delivery*, Doctrinal Theology is called either *Positive* or *Scholastic*: which are incorrectly distinguished from one another, in such a way that the former is said to be conversant in the *exposition of Scripture*, the latter in the *deriving of Dogmas and common Places*; see MARESIUS' *Systema Theologicum*, locus I, § 8, note a: for dogmas are also to be derived in the exposition of Scripture, and common Places and dogmas ought to depend upon the explication or sense and authority of sacred Scripture. BUDDEUS from the writings of the Papists sets forth a sense of this distinction somewhat different still, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter I, tome I, pages 336b, 337a, and § 15, page 404b, chapter III, § 9, page 578b. But *Positive* Theology is that which is not so bound by logical rules, but it more freely and in an oratorical manner

¹ Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588-1638) was a German Reformed Pastor, Theologian, and Encyclopedist. He served as Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Herborn (1608-1629).

² Philipp Heinrich Friedlieb (1603-1663) was a Lutheran Pastor and Theologian. He served as Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at Greifswald (1628-1630).

handles and declares divine things as the circumstance arises, either in accordance with the texture of the whole of Scripture, or of a part of it, or otherwise. On the other hand, *Scholastic* Theology, so called in a good sense, proceeds in a disciplined method, and exhibits divine truths reduced unto fixed heads according to the rules of Logic for the use of Christian schools. Now, the use of this Scholastic Theology in Christian Schools Theologians uphold against various *Anabaptists* and Fanatics of that sort, who without a fixed order of doctrine in the passing on of Religion are themselves whirled about, and think it proper for others to be whirled about: see DORESLAER and AUSTRO-SYLVIVS, *contra Anabaptistas*, chapter XVI, § I, pages 385, 386, 390-405. Likewise against others, who too often inculcate the simple Reading and Explication of Scripture, having in contempt *Locos communes*, *common Places*, as *Locos cum nugis*, *Places with frivolities*: just as *Arminius* and his followers in the century past led the way, rattling on about a Scriptural Theology, that is, purged of Scholastic dregs: “I,” writes *Arminius* to *Utenbogardus*,¹ “meanwhile strive vigorously, that the reason be not missed why they are angry, in opening to hearers the true senses of the Scriptures to the best of my ability, and in this manner attracting them to my Readings.” *Episcopus* likewise writes to *Michael Schneider*: “The method of composing Theology I make my own and free to each. Theology is not an art, not a ordering by art of common Places. Substance makes a Theologian, not order.... Moreover, method varies according to the ability and mind of each.... Thus I have always believed that the best Theologian is one that makes the text of Scriptures so familiar to himself that he is able to discuss any matter proposed, even without art, without method. The Textual Theologian is the best Theologian.” In which place he then goes out against the abuse of methodical Theology, that it happens whenever anyone according to their own art or method judges the whole sense of Scripture, while on the other hand he ought to compare the observations of his mind and art to the norm of Scripture: see *præstantium Virorum Epistolas*, pages 201, 738.

However, as the abuse of a thing does not destroy its use; so, on the other hand, our Theologians observe that this *Institution* of passing on Theology by the Scholastic method is, 1. *Most Ancient*: inasmuch as the Fathers in a certain measure went before in the *Expositions of the Symbols*,

¹ Johannes Utenbogardus (1557-1644) was a Dutch minister, a follower of Arminius, and a leader of the Remonstrants after Arminius' death.

which sort is that of Ruffinus,¹ for example, which is found also within the works of Cyprian, *published by Jacobus Pamelius*,² tome 3, pages 538 and following; and also of Jerome, *published by Erasmus*, tome 4, pages 101 and following: in *Enchiridia*, of which sort is that of Augustine to Laurentius, delivering the sum and principal heads of the whole Christian Doctrine: in *Expositions*, of which sort is the ἔκθεσις or Exposition of the correct faith, found in the works of Justin Martyr, but which nevertheless is judged to be spurious and of a later age; see GERHARD'S³ *Patrologiam*, pages 83-85. But it is also permissible to commend the example of God and Christ Himself, who delivered examples of an exact method in the *Decalogue*, in the summary of it in Matthew 22:37-40, in the *Lord's Prayer*; and also of θεοπνεύστων/*God-inspired*⁴ men, especially of *Paul*, who in the *Epistle to the Romans* delivered the doctrine of salvation in a most elegant method, and *enumerated the elementary heads of the faith before the Hebrews*, Hebrews 6:1, 2. Hence it is allowable to be argued: Whoever furnished and attested Examples of an exact method in divine things, he approves, and even requires, this in divine things. But God furnished examples of this sort, as already seen.

Likewise: Whoever in an order altogether free, but at the same time definite, and agreeing with Logical method, dictated the Sacred Scripture to the Prophets and Apostles, and commanded that the same be rightly divided; he is not opposed to order or method in the delivery of Theology: But God did those things. Therefore. The former member of the Major, in addition to the things already observed previously, is proven from a Logical analysis, provided by learned men, of the Old and New Testaments in their entirety. The latter member is proven from 2 Timothy 2:15.

¹ Ruffinus was a fourth century churchman, a friend of Jerome turned foe, a commentator, and a monastery builder. He wrote *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum*.

² Jacobus Pamelius (1536-1587) was a Flemish theologian. He produced edited works, not only of Cyprian, but also of Tertullian and Rabanus Maurus.

³ John Gerhard (1582-1637) was an eminent Lutheran divine. He held the position of Professor of Divinity at Jena (1616), and he was four times the Rector of the same. He wrote copiously in exegetical, polemical, and dogmatic theology. His *Loci communes theologici* (1610-1622) was the largest Lutheran dogmatic text that had been produced to date.

⁴ 2 Timothy 3:16: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος), and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness..."

2. In addition, this institution is also *Most Useful, both for the acquisition and the teaching of a distinct knowledge of Theological matters*, in a manner suited to the very nature of the matters to be delivered, and therefore it is best adopted: for, where are presented various, homogeneous doctrines, subordinated one to another, and arranged toward one and the same end; there logical method has place, and is best observed. But, in Theology are presented various, homogeneous doctrines (for they all treat of divine things), indeed subordinated among themselves, as cause and effect, antecedent and consequent; and they are also arranged toward one and the same goal, which is the glory of God and the salvation of the Church.

3. Indeed, this institution, *with the extraordinary gifts passing away, on account of the weakness of our intellect and memory, is sufficiently Necessary for favorable progress*: for, if without a prop of this sort it would fall to each by reading to draw forth the principal heads from the Sacred Scripture; for the confirmation of the same matter one might not so easily have many passages in readiness: and, if he should happen upon a passage in appearance favoring adversaries, being doubtful, he would be obliged to hesitate until he should discover another passage, by which the former should be explained.

Neither ought it to be *Objected*: 1. That what exceeds the capacity and conception of human reason, also exceeds Logical method, which is built thereupon. Theology exceeds the capacity and conception of human reason. Therefore.

Response: It is the fallacy *à dicto secundum quid, from a qualified maxim, ad dictum simpliciter, unto a simple maxim*: for according to Scripture Theology exceeds the capacity of the animal man only, not of the spiritual man, at least not completely, who discerns spiritual things, and hence orders and arranges the same; see 1 Corinthians 2:9-15.

2. That what transcends all sciences, also transcends Logical method. Theology transcends all Sciences. Therefore.

Response: The Major is to be denied; for sciences treat of matters natural and knowable; but Logic treats not of things, but of the manner of teaching and explaining things, whether those things be designated natural in the Sciences, or supernatural in Theology; if indeed the same method of delivering each in notions simple and composite obtains.

3. That what detracts from the simplicity of Theological doctrine, ought not to be employed concerning it. Method detracts from the simplicity of Theological doctrine, inasmuch as it is obscured by

the artifice and subtlety of method. Therefore.

Response: 1. The Minor is to be denied: for method does not change the genus of Theological doctrine, but only arranges it in an appropriate order, so that it might be more easily understood. 2. Or it shall be the fallacy of accident. That happens, not by the fault of method, but by the ignorance of the artificer, bending doctrine unto the rules of method, not prudently adapting method to that doctrine: consult HEINRICH ALTING'S *Theologiam problematicam novam*, locus I, problem II, pages 9-12. These objections against us, as if erring in this part, moves also ECKHARDUS, in his *Fasciculo Controversiarum cum Calvino*, chapter I, question 3, pages 16-18. For the right use of Systems of Theology read the disputation of Anonymous, *de Nederlandse Bibliotheek*, volume 4, n. 10, Mengelst, pages 289-316.

§ 26: Scholastic Theology

Nevertheless, the name of *Scholastic Theology* is wont to be taken in an inferior sense, for that which was delivered in the *Schools of the Papists* in particular, after the twelfth century, according the institution of *Peter Lombard*;¹ those Masters of Philosophical and Theological Schools that follow it, hence are called, by an ancient term, but with new significance, *Scholastics*.

SPANHEIM'S *Historia Ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti*, Century V, chapter III, column 964: "In this age also, the name of *Scholastics* was common, yet in a sense diverse from today's. At most thus were called experts in Law, Advocates, Defenders, ἑκδίκου/*Attorneys*, who were taught the art of speaking, and the Statutes or Laws, in the great *Schools*, which sort were in Rome and Constantinople, like Socrates Scholasticus,² Agathias Scholasticus,³ Evagrius,⁴ and the like. The name *Scholastic* was also used for the erudite, the wise; for the Master in Schools, in Monasteries; likewise for the scholar or student, in Augustine's *Confessions*, and elsewhere. Then, after the times of Charlemagne,⁵ it was a name partly of *Dignity*, and he was

¹ Peter Lombard (c. 1096-c. 1164), although of relatively humble birth, became a renowned theologian in Paris. His *Four Books of Sentences* served as a standard theological text at medieval universities.

² Socrates of Constantinople, sometimes called Socrates Scholasticus (born c. 380), was an historian from Constantinople who wrote *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, covering the years 305-439, as a continuation of Eusebius' history.

³ Agathias Scholasticus (c. 530-c. 590), of Myrina in western Asia Minor, was a student of law in Alexandria, and practiced law in the courts of Constantinople. However, he had a deep love of literature, composing Greek poems, and a history, picking up where Procopius leaves off, covering a period of Justinian I's reign (527-565).

⁴ Evagrius Scholasticus (sixth century) was a Syrian scholar and lawyer. He wrote a six-volume *Ecclesiastical History*, treating the period from the First Council of Ephesus (431) to the author's time (593) under the reign of Maurice.

⁵ Charlemagne (c. 745-814) was King of the Franks (768), King of Italy (774), and the first emperor of the Western Roman Empire (800) in three centuries. In addition to his many achievements, he did much to revive learning in Europe.

called a Scholastic who was in charge Scholars; partly of *profession*, and the same was called a Scholastic and Professor of liberal arts, as in Launoïus'¹ *de Scholis celebrioribus*, chapter XXIII; partly of *office*, and he was called a Scholastic that was of the School of Cantors; partly of *doctrine*, like those that taught unpolished Philosophy and Theology from the times of Lombard." Again, SPANHEIM'S *Historia Ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti*, Century XII, chapter X, § 3, column 1617, 1618: "From this time, however many followed the method, doctrine, and authority of Lombard were called *Scholastics*, an ancient name, but with a new significance. For originally public Edifices, into which men were gathering, whether for the sake of studying, or of observing or waiting, in which a strict Discipline was observed, were called *Schools*. Hence the Schools, some Imperial, others of Civil Magistrates, then others of Bishops, Priests, Cantors, Monks, etc. Also, they were called *Scholastics*, that were pleading cases in court, that were making speeches concerning lawsuits; hence that were eloquent and articulate; then that were wise, erudite, experts in Law: Afterwards that were presiding in Schools by right of Dignity, Patronage, whence the title of Dignity, *Scholastic*; Finally that were teaching in the Schools, the Masters of Schools, whether these were erected in Monasteries or elsewhere, Philosophical or Theological; specifically that teach Philosophy and Theology, which they then called *Scholastic*." Concerning the term *Scholasticus*, Σχολαστικὸς, see also MEURSIUS'² *Glossarium græco-barbarum*; VOSSIUS' *Etymologicon Linguae Latinæ*; MARTINIUS'³ *Lexicon philologicum*; DU FRESNE Lord du Cange's⁴ *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis*; PITISCUS'⁵ *Lexicon Antiquitatum Romanarum*.

One may observe a threefold period of this Theology:

¹ Jean de Launoï (1603-1678) was French, critical historian. With respect to ecclesiastical politics, he was a Gallican; with respect to theology, a Jansenist.

² Johannes van Meurs (1579-1639) was a Dutch classical scholar, Professor of Greek and History at Leiden (1610). Suspected of Arminianism, he accepted an offer to become Professor of history at Sorbo in Zealand.

³ Matthias Martinius (1572-1630) was a German Reformed Theologian and educator. He was instrumental in the founding of the Gymnasium at Bremen, and taught Johannes Cocceius.

⁴ Charles de Fresne, Lord du Cange (1610-1688), was a philologist and historian of Medieval Europe and Byzantium.

⁵ Samuel Pitiscus (1637-1727) was a Dutch classicist.

α. Dawning, in the *Twelfth Century*, when *Peter the Lombard*, so called from his ancestral land, Bishop of Paris from 1159 onward, called *Master of the Sentences* from his principal writing, according to the pattern of John Damascenus' books *Concerning the Orthodox Faith* wrote *Four Books of Sentences*, in which he reduced the Theology of that time into a compendium, by Distinctions and Sentences drawn from Hilary, Ambrose, especially Augustine, etc., with the sentences of the Fathers brought together in nearly equal authority with the Sacred Scriptures. In the first book he treats of the Unity and Trinity of God: in the second, of the creation, especially of angels and men, free will, divine grace, original and actual sin: in the third, of the Economy of the Incarnation, redemption through Christ, faith, hope, love, the commandments of both tables: in the fourth, of the Roman Church's Sacraments, both true and false; of the Last Things, namely, the resurrection, judgment, and eternal life and death. Nevertheless, some relate that Lombard's work of Sentences plagiarized from just so many *books* of Theological Sentences of a certain *Bandinus*, an obscure and almost unknown Theologian, with others holding the completely opposite opinion; see THOMASIIUS¹ *de Plagio literario*, § 493 and following; KÖNIG'S² *Bibliothecam Veterem et Novam*; OLEARIIUS³ *Bibliothecam Ecclesiasticam*. Now, at this time and after which the Scholastic Doctors arose, the Scriptures began to be neglected to a greater extent, and the Fathers to be regarded as equal to them, and all Theology, as AVENTINUS⁴ say in his *Annalibus Bojorum*, book VI, to be mixed up with the mud of questions and the rivulets of opinions.

β. A greater augment of this Theology follows in the *Thirteenth Century*, when they proceeded to deliver Theology according to the method of Lombard, but with this difference; that in this Age the Metaphysics of Aristotle, such as they understood it at that time, and all his Philosophy, delivered in several volumes by *Albert Magnus*,⁵ they took

¹ Jakob Thomasius (1622-1684) was a German philosopher and jurist. He was an important figure in establishing the history of philosophy as a scholarly discipline.

² Georg Matthias König (1616-1698) was a German biographer and historian.

³ Joannes Gottfridus Olearius (1635-1711) was a German Lutheran Pastor, Theologian, and Hymn-writer.

⁴ Johannes Aventinus (1477-1534) was Bavarian humanist. He wrote *Annales Bojorum*, as Bavaria's official historian, containing much valuable information on the early history of Germany. Although he remained in the Roman Church, he was sympathetic to aspects of the Reformation.

⁵ Albert the Great (c. 1193-1280) was a German Dominican friar and eventual

up also as a principium of Theological demonstrations: to such an extent that the propositions and axioms of this Philosophy were regarded far before the sayings of the Fathers, indeed even the proclamations of Sacred Scripture. Now, the originator of this stage of the Scholastic method was the excellent *Albert Suevus*,¹ with the cognomen of *Magnus, the Great*, even while he was living, of the Order of Preachers,² after being Master of Cologne made Bishop of Regensburg after 1259, but who returned after two years, with the Episcopate abdicated, to the Monastery of Cologne. He was the first to write Commentaries upon all the works of Aristotle, and then also of Peter Lombard. He died in 1280, after his memory had completely failed. His Works, divided into twenty-one Tomes, were published in 1651. Now, besides Albert, in this age, the most celebrated men were, 1. *Thomas Aquinas*, whose father was Count of Aquino,³ who in turn was born of the blood of Sicilian Kings. He would come to be called the *Angelic Doctor*, to whom, in the writing of his books, Peter and Paul would sometimes be present: "This opinion of him arose," as SPANHEIM narrates in his *Historia Ecclesiastica, Century XIII, chapter XII, § 3, page 1711*, "from his metaphysical acumen and subtlety in disputation, from his industry in building the tenets of the Roman Church and in daubing its errors; from his fervor in opposing the so-called *Manichæans*,⁴ that is, the Albigensians;⁵ indeed, also from the multitude of his books, with the fullest submission toward the Roman chair until the year of his death, 1274." 2. *Bonaventure*,⁶ contemporary of Thomas, of the Order of Friars Minor,⁷ called the *Seraphic Doctor*,

Bishop of Regensburg (1260). He is regarded by many as the greatest theologian and philosopher of his age; his publications were instrumental in making the thought of Aristotle much more widely accessible. He taught Thomas Aquinas.

¹ Albert was born in Bavaria.

² That is, the Dominicans.

³ Aquino was on the west coast of central Italy.

⁴ Manichæism, arising in the third century, was form of Gnostic dualism, teaching the co-eternality of good and evil. Human history is the long process of the separation of spiritual light (the good) from material darkness (the evil).

⁵ The Albigensians were dissenters from the Roman Catholic Church, thriving in southern France from the twelfth to the fourteenth century. They were accused of Manichæan dualism by their Roman prosecutors.

⁶ Bonaventure (1221-1274) was an Italian Franciscan theologian and philosopher.

⁷ That is, the Franciscans.

virtually the director of the Second Council of Lyon in 1274,¹ with which not yet finished he met his death; promoted to the purple by Gregory X,² to the Saints by Sixtus IV.³

γ. The last era of the Scholastics is referred to the *Fourteenth Century*, when yet greater curiosity and impurity was introduced. In this age are remember above the rest, *Durandus* of Saint-Pourçain, the *Most Resolute* Doctor, Bishop of Meaux, who died in 1333 in Meaux: But also *John Duns Scotus*,⁴ who in 1307 began to peddle a doctrine, previously unheard of in the Church, concerning the Immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, and who, stricken with apoplexy, or seized with coma, may have been interred in the grave while yet living, from which he vainly endeavored to get out, with his hands worn away. The *Fifteenth Century* was no less prolific with respect to Scholastics, even unto the times of *Thomas Cajetan*,⁵ that is, of Luther and Zwingli, when the age of the Scholastics comes to an end. The long series of Scholastic Doctors is given by the Most Illustrious PICTET in his *Præfatione Theologiæ Christianæ*. A history of Scholastic Theology and of the Scholastics worth reading is set forth by BUDDEUS, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter I, § 9, 10, tome 1, pages 357-369, with whom compare SPANHEIM, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Century XII, chapter X, § 1-4, Century XIII, chapter XII, Century XIV, chapter XI, § I, columns 1616-1618, 1710-1712, 1796, 1797.

In a few words, our AUTHOR comprehends many things, when he observes concerning this Theology, that the same is displeasing and hateful in four principal things for these reasons:

α. With respect to the *Principium*, on account of the authority of the Fathers and Philosopher introduced, and the same made equal, indeed even preferred, to the Sacred Scripture.

β. With respect to the *Argument*, on account of the curiosity and

¹ This Council met in an endeavor to reunite the Eastern and Western Churches. Ultimately, the achievements of the Council proved short-lived.

² Gregory X (reigning from 1271-1276) granted to Bonaventure the title of Cardinal Bishop.

³ Sixtus IV (reigning from 1471-1484) canonized Bonaventure in 1482.

⁴ John Duns Scotus (1266-1308) was a Scottish Franciscan theologian and philosopher. He lectured and wrote on Lombard's *Sentences*. He was known as the *Subtle Doctor*.

⁵ Thomas Cajetan (1469-1534) was an Italian cardinal and one of the more able opponents of the Reformation. He wrote a commentary upon Aquinas' *Summa Theologica*.

falsehood of the same. For example, it was disputed by those Acute Doctors, Of what sort of nature was Mary, fleshy or lean? Whether it were possible that Mary had more children by that singular Generation, by which she begat the Word? Whether Mary while sleeping had the use of reason? Whether she was the Apostle of the Apostles and an expert in all mechanical arts? Whether in the state of innocence there were going to be an equal number of men and women? Whether it is permissible to excommunicate sparrows and other brutes that defile the Church? Whether anyone is able to be baptized in lye, honey-wine, the gravy of meats, the broth of fish, or urine? Whether baptism is valid, if it be conferred in the name of the Devil? Whether Christ was obliged or able to assume the nature of a woman, an ass, a serpent, or a dove? Whether these and similar propositions, God is a hoopoe, God is a scarab, are equally possible with this, God is a man? Whether the Roman Pontiff be God, or man, or one from both? The Most Illustrious PICTET, *Præfatione Theologiæ Christianæ*, also sets forth these Scholastic questions.

γ. With respect to the *Mode of delivery*, on account of the barbarous terms and obscure distinctions, and disputes upon both sides in an academic and subtle manner.

δ. With respect to the *End and Effect*, namely, the obscuring of true and scriptural Theology and the neglect of the Scriptures.

Nevertheless, it also has some things by which it commends itself, namely; α. *βραχυλογία*, *concise forms of expression*, so that by this or that term a thing is signified briefly and vigorously, which without a Scholastic term of this sort would require a long periphrasis. β. It has certain laudable Philosophical Principles: and, γ. shining testimonies of heavenly truth; so that from the Scholastics many things are able to be fetched, which make for the piercing of the errors of Papal Religion; just as from the beginning in *Lombard* himself many more sensible things are observed, in those things, for example, which have regard to the Corruption of man and divine Grace, borrowed principally from *Augustine*. And thus JOHANN GERHARD published in *four volumes, quarto*, *Confessionem Catholicam*, in which distinguished work he confirmed the Catholic truth with distinguished testimonies out of Popish authors, for the most part out of the Scholastics.

And thus far this Theology is of some good use also, neither does it come to be altogether rejected. Some care of the Theologian deserves to be spent upon it also, although not the first or principal care, but almost the last; after the likeness of those that, visiting royal palaces,

after the magnificence of the bed chambers and dining rooms, disdain even to look upon the latrines, except in passing, on account of the odor: just as CHAMIER, in his *Epistolis Jesuiticis ad Cottonum*, writes that he himself had done.

If one be a complete stranger to the Scholastics, he shall by no means be able to dispute with the Papists; nor with the Socinians, since these also draw their objections in great part from the Scholastics; and these would buy at great price, if from hatred of Scholastic Theology we all should determine to cast away the technical terms from Theology, a great number of which are actually owed to the Scholastics, and should bind the Theologian to make use only of terms found *αὐτολεξεῖ*, in express words, in Sacred Scripture. Therefore, thus the terms *Trinity*, *Consubstantial*, *ὁμοουσίου*/*homousios*, *Christ's Satisfaction*, etc., also should be banished. But there are technical terms of this sort in Theology, just as there are numeric signs in Arithmetic, and individual letters in Algebra. No less absurdly would you require from a Theologian and Doctor in an Academy, that he send all Theological terms into eternal exile, than if you would require from a Preacher, that in the explanation of the sacred text he make use of no other word than what stands in the Sacred Books. Therefore, Scholastic Theology is to be called into use as far as it or its terms are able to be useful; but all abuse of it is to be avoided: here, as in all things, the limit is to be observed, and precautions are to be taken lest anything exceed: consult VOETIUS' *Disputationem de Theologia Scholastica*, volume I, *Disputationum theologicarum*, pages 12-29; GERHARD'S *Confessionem catholicam*, tome I, book I, *generalis, posteriorem partem*, chapter XV, which is *de Scholasticis*, pages 743-762; HEINRICH ALTING'S *Theologiam problematicam novam*, locus I, problem XIII, pages 53-58. Especially concerning the Philosophy of the Scholastics see BUDDEUS and those whom he recommends in *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book I, chapter IV, § 22, tome 1, pages 230b, 231a, who also discusses the defects of Scholastic Theology, on account of which, nevertheless, he does not will that Systematic Theology be rejected, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter I, § 16, tome 1, pages 423-426; and particularly the Moral doctrine of the Scholastics, *Isagoge ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter IV, § 10, tome 1, pages 710, 711a.

§ 27: Definition of Revealed Theology

The *Definition* of Revealed Theology follows. Our AUTHOR says he *leaves to his authorities* the Definition of *Theology*, in accordance with which it is called the *Speech of the Theologian*; an *explanation* of which, he writes, *is again added through certain obscurer phrases*: these things have regard unto those which out of the Most Illustrious COCCEIUS I have already related at the end of § 1. Now, our AUTHOR rightly observes that this Definition is *truly paronymic*, and thus a definition, not of the *thing*, but of the *name* only, a definition which explains the signification of the name, which among other things is wont to be done with an *etymologically related word*. Now, as is known, *Theology* Logically is a primitive term, which denotes the matter simply as regarded in itself, or in the abstract; but *Theologian* is a term paronymic or derivative, which denotes a thing in the concrete: but these two terms are said to be Etymologically related, that is, of related significance, derived from the same principium. On the other hand, our AUTHOR sets forth the *Real Definition*, saying that Theology is the *Doctrine that relates true Religion to fallen man from the Revelation of God, for the salvation of man and the glory of God*: in which the *Genus* is *Doctrine*; and the *Difference of Species* is sought, α . from the *Principium* whence it is drawn, which is the *Revelation of God*; β . from the *Object*, which it treats, which is *true Religion*; γ . from the *Subject*, who is instructed, namely, *man as sinner*; δ . from the *End* that is intended, *subordinate*, which is the *salvation of man*; and *supreme*, which is the *glory of God*.

§ 28: The Genus of Theology

In § 28-31, the *Genus* of this Definition is explained.

In general, we call Theology a *Doctrine* or teaching, just as in the New Testament it is called a διδαχή/*doctrine*, John 7:16, 17;¹ a διδασκαλία/*doctrine/teaching*, 1 Timothy 6:3;² and both words occur at the same time in Titus 1:9.³ Now, it is *Doctrine*, as our AUTHOR rightly reminds, because, α. *it is taught by God*, and, β. *it is learned by the Church*.

But it is now asked, What sort of *Doctrine* is Theology, *Theoretical* or *Practical*? which Question was moved by the *Scholastics*, among whom *Durandus*, in his *prolegomeno Sententiarum quæstionum* VI, and others maintained that theology is purely speculative. *Scotus* with his followers said that the same is purely practical. But others said that it is mixed, that is, speculative and practical at the same time: but either more speculative, like the *Thomists*; or more practical, *Thomas de Argentina*.⁴

This question turned out to be of greater moment, because the *Socinians* and *Remonstrants* made the whole of Theology *practical* with a perverse intention, namely, so that they might separate the knowledge of mysteries, for example, the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc., from the fundamentals of Religion, and say that Religion is summed up in the obedience of precepts and the faith of promises. Thus *Episcopus*, *Institutionibus Theologicis*, book I, chapter II, asserts that *Theology is not a speculative science, but practical; neither is it partly speculative and partly*

¹ John 7:16, 17: “Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine (ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχή) is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine (περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς), whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.”

² 1 Timothy 6:3: “If any man teach otherwise (ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ), and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness (τῇ κατ’ εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ)…”

³ Titus 1:9: “Holding fast the word faithful according to the teaching (τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου), that he may be able by sound doctrine (ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ) both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.”

⁴ Thomas of Strasburg (1275-1357) was a scholastic theologian of the Augustinian Order, serving as General of the Order from 1345 until his death. He wrote a commentary on Lombard’s *Sentences*.

practical; but a *purely practical* science. This the Remonstrants also argue in their *Apologia pro Confessione*, pages 17, 18, in which they at the same time falsely accuse us, as if our Theology were *merely speculative*.

Indeed, *Theoretical* is the Discipline that is occupied in contemplation alone, and has no other end than knowledge. *Practical* is the Discipline that does not stand in the knowledge of the matter alone, but in its own nature and of itself leads on to practice, and has activity as its end.

As so, if one or the other must be chosen here; it would be better to be said, yet with the error of the *Socinians* and *Arminians* put away, that Theology is a *Practical* Discipline, rather than a *Theoretical* Discipline; for, 1. all knowledge of Religion is to be drawn unto practice, John 13:17; 1 Timothy 1:5: 2. and the End, of the glorification of God and salvation of men, is *Practical*.

At the same time, HEINRICH ALTING, in his *Theologia problematica nova*, locus I, problem IV, page 15, and FRANCIS TURRETIN, in his *Theologiae Elencticae*, locus I, question VII, § 5, not incorrectly observe that arguments, which prove that Theology is either *Theoretical* or *Practical*, if they must be taken exclusively of one another, generally fail and restrict Theology too much: but, if they be understood inclusively, are equally true; since they think that Theology is of a mixed sort. And thus also the *Censura Confessionis Remonstrantium* has in § 31, “We confess that *truth that is according to piety*¹ is not merely speculative; but that it is to be held as merely practical, we do not approve, because a true sense concerning God and divine things also pertains to piety. For one that is not well informed in his understanding concerning God and His will is not able rightly to worship God, nor to love his neighbor.” Therefore, you might aptly call Theology a *Theoretico-Practical* Doctrine, which our AUTHOR also urges: and this is proven by, 1. the *Object*, which is God, to be known and worshipped as the first truth and highest good. 2. The *Subject*, man, to be perfected in the knowledge of the truth, by which his intellect is illuminated; and in the love of the good, by which his will is adorned; in faith, which is extended unto πιστὰ, *things to be believed*, and in love, which is extended unto πρακτὰ, *things to be done*. 3. The *Principium*, both *external*, the Word of God, which

¹ Titus 1:1: “Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God’s elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness (ἀληθείας τῆς κατ’ εὐσέβειαν; *veritatis, quæ secundum pietatem est*, in the Vulgate).”

comprehends the Law and the Gospel; the Law sets forth things to be done, the Gospel things to be believed and known: and *internal*, the Spirit, who is the *Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah*, Isaiah 11:2. 4. The *End*, proximate and immediate, theory of the true and praxis of the good, neither to be excluded, since only that knowledge of God is able to be true with which praxis is joined, 1 John 2:4; neither is praxis right and salutary, except that which is directed by knowledge, John 17:3. Likewise, the *End* of Theology is the salvation of man: but this also has been placed partly in the vision of God, partly in the enjoyment of Him.

Many words are not now necessary to respond to the Objections of *Durandus* and others, and of the *Thomists*, who said that Theology is either merely or more speculative.

Objection 1: That it is called Knowledge, John 17:3; etc. *Response:* 1. Theology is able to be denominated by one of its parts in this way: 2. it is knowledge conjoined with practice, 1 John 2:4: 3. and it is often understood as practical, which includes knowledge, faith, love, and the reverence of God.

Objection 2: That the Object of Theology, which is God, is not πρακτὸν, a thing to be done, or a thing done by man. *Response:* This perhaps could be missing, if we should say that Theology is merely practical knowledge, not when we call it *Theoretico-practical*. 2. But not every practical habit has an object πρακτὸν, *to be done*, operable, as indeed Ethics does, which teaches to do its object, that is, to produce virtues: but that is also called a practical habit which teaches to do something concerning its object; and in this sense Theology is able to be called a practical habit, because it teaches to perform worship concerning God. And so our AUTHOR well observes that the knowledge and worship of God are yet πρακτὰ, *things to be done*, and able to be rendered by man.

Objection 3: That the Method of Theology is Synthetic. *Response:* *Synthetic Method* is opposed to *Analytic*. *Synthetic Method* begins from a principium, and through its object and subject tends toward its end: *Analytic Method* begins with an end, and proceeds to means. They maintain that the former agrees more with Theoretical disciplines, the latter with Practical disciplines. But, 1. Method is arbitrary/discretionary in handing on disciplines; and, 2. it varies in various works, inasmuch as the *Catechesis Heidelbergensis* employs an *Analytic Method*. On this Question consult HOORNBEECK'S *Theologiam*

Practicam, preface, pages 5-17.

§ 29: Theology as Apprehensive and Discursive

Concerning the *Genus* of Theology, which is *Doctrine*, it is observed moreover that it is not simply *Noëtic*, but also *Dianoëtic*, or not merely *Apprehensive*, but also *Discursive*, which passes from one thing to another, and gathers one thing from another. A *Doctrine* would be *Noëtic*, if it simply relates what things are thus verbatim read expressly in Sacred Scripture: but now it is *Discursive*, *Argumentative*, because it teaches also through discursus, what thing are not αὐτολεξεῖ, *in the very words*, read expressly in Sacred Scripture. Thus, with our AUTHOR reminding, α. Theology gives an account of its principium, that is, the divinity of the Sacred Scriptures from Marks inscribed in it: β. draws out other Truths from the Truths apprehended from a simple reading therein: γ. and confutes the opposite Errors.

Since this is not able to be done without the drawing of *Consequences*, our AUTHOR on this occasion contends that *Consequences*, if they be legitimate and innate, not imported, are lawful, useful, necessary in Theology, and that truths thus drawn out are divinely revealed: he argues this, 1. *From the Example of Christ and of the Apostles*, which it is lawful for us to imitate according to the measure of knowledge given to us. Thus in Matthew 22:31, 32: *But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* In which the principal force of the argument is not in this, that God spoke these words after the death of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for without a future Resurrection God was able to be called also the *God of Abraham* after his death in this sense, that Abraham while living had acknowledged and worshipped Him, indeed also because after death he was yet living to God according to the spirit: but in this, that God to those, whose God He is, ought to render a reward worthy of Himself, of which sort there is none, except that which is eternal; of which they ought to have full enjoyment according to the spirit and the body equally, since they are equally God's, and in which two equally they worshipped Him, and which as two essential parts together constitute man: now, the promise, *I shall be a God to thee*, was not made to the soul

of Abraham apart from the rest, but to the whole person consisting of soul and body; hence, if Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were now after death living to God according to the spirit, they also would live at some point according to the body: see VOETIUS' *Disputationum theologicarum*, volume I, page 758; WITSIUS' *Æconomiam Fœderum*, book III, chapter II, § 4-16. Thus Paul from the Resurrection of Christ proves the Resurrection of all believers; and he also confirms the truth of the Resurrection of Christ Himself from various absurdities that otherwise follow, 1 Corinthians 15:12-23. Thus by inference the Apostles were also obliged to prove that Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messiah promised in the Old Testament, since concerning Him nothing αὐτολεξεῖν, *in express words*, is read in the Old Testament. Neither ought it to be *excepted* that the authority of Christ and the Apostles is infallible, and that therefore the consequences which they derive are of indubitable truth, but that our consequences are not such. For, although in themselves, by the authority of the one speaking, the consequences of Christ and the Apostles are infallible; the consequence does not have its force, for example, which consequence the Lord derived in Matthew 22:31, 32 among the Sadducees, from the authority of the one speaking, which authority they were not acknowledging; but from the nature of the things said, and for that reason only was it admitted by them, for it was discerned to have its foundation in the saying of Moses alleged by Christ. And thus always, when the Sacred Scriptures are argued, the force of the Consequence is situated in the natural connection of the Truths set forth and deduced from them. 2. *From the commandments to Search, distinct from a simple reading*, John 5:39; Daniel 12:4. Now, *we search*, not when we stick in the skin of the words, but when we attempt to penetrate unto the very marrow and inner sense; and from those things that we read, we also in some way or other understand things which we read not, as Augustine says. Those that neglect this are refuted, Matthew 22:29; Luke 24:25, 26. 3. *From the Uses of the Sacred Scripture, which are not able to be obtained without consequences*, 2 Timothy 3:16; Romans 15:4. But no thesis shall ever be able to be translated into a hypothesis, neither shall any application of Scripture ever be able to be made available for Uses, either Theoretical or Practical, without consequences brought in. Add, 4. the Consent of the Fathers in LEYDEKKER'S *Veritate Euangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XIX, § 10, pages 147, 148. Indeed, see also SPANHEIM *the Younger's Stricturas adversus Bossueti Expositionem*

Doctrinæ Catholicæ,¹ chapter II, *opera*, tome III, columns 1070-1073. These arguments and others for the legitimate use of Consequences are prolixly urged, and from multifarious Exceptions of adversaries are admirably vindicated by SPANHEIM the Elder in his *Disputationibus Anti-Anabaptisticis*, *Disputationum theologicarum*, part 2, *Disputations XXI-XXXII*.

The ancient *Arians* are opposed, who were repudiating τὸ ὁμοούσιον, *the homoousios*,² as not found in the Sacred Scriptures αὐτολεξεῖ, *in express words*; also the *Pneumatomachi*,³ who were denying the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, because it is never said in the Sacred Scripture in so many words, The Holy Spirit is God, according to GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Oration V, de Theologia*; also the *Apollinarians*⁴ and *Monophysites*,⁵ according to MAXIMUS *Monachus*,⁶ in *Orationibus XX*, commonly attributed to *Athanasius*: consult SPANHEIM'S *Disputationes Anti-Anabaptisticas*, *Disputationum theologicarum*, part 2, *Disputation XXVI*. Indeed, this is wont to be done by all, as many as feel themselves to be pressed by consequences.

It is not strange then, that neither do the *Anabaptists*, at least a portion of them, concede a place for Consequences and the concluding of one thing from another. Which is evident from the colloquies upon

¹ Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) was a Roman Catholic bishop and theologian. He served as the court preacher to Louis XIV of France, and was renowned for his oratorical abilities. His *Exposition de la foi catholique* was an attempt to reunite French Protestants to the Roman Church, by giving a somewhat modified and moderate presentation of Roman dogma.

² In the Arian crisis, the term, *homoousios* (a word not found in Scripture), was used by the Orthodox to assert that Christ is of *the same substance* with the Father.

³ The *Pneumatomachi* (the Spirit-fighters), also known as the Macedonians, Semi-Arians, or Tropici, were an anti-Nicene sect, thriving in the countries around the Hellespont. They denied the Deity of the Holy Spirit.

⁴ Apollinaris (died 390), bishop of Laodicea, in his zeal to emphasize the full Deity of Jesus Christ and the unity of His person, asserted that Jesus was human with respect to his body, but His rational soul had been replaced by the Divine Logos.

⁵ The Monophysites believe that the two natures of Jesus Christ are, in the incarnation, so united as to form a single nature.

⁶ Maximus Monachus of Constantinople, sometimes also called the Confessor or the Theologian (c. 580-662), was a monk, scholar, and theologian. He opposed Monothelitism, and suffered exile and torture for his position, which occasioned his death. His position was vindicated at the Third Council of Constantinople.

the exposition of the words in John 1:14, *and the Word was made flesh*, where they urge τὸ ῥητὸν, *the thing expressed*, and the letter precisely; and from their protests, indeed, their triumphing, that Pædobaptism is not able to be proven from the express words out of Sacred Scripture. Yet the Anabaptists of Rypin¹ deny against SPANHEIM *the Younger*, that *they reject legitimate Consequences*. So far, so good, say the Most Illustrious Man. Yet they do, for example, in the case of Pædobaptism, *Elencho controversiarum cum Enthusiastis et Anabaptistis*, § IV, *opera*, tome 3, column 779. Neither is it helpful to object anything out of 2 Corinthians 10:5 and Colossians 2:8, for, 1. in the former place the Apostle is not discussing all *Rationcinations*, as worthy of opposition through the arms of our warfare; but only λογισμοῖς ἐπαιρομένοις κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, *reasonings lifted up against the knowledge of God*, reasonings opposing, that is, not submitting to the Gospel. Such *rationcinations* are to be pulled down, because they are ἀσύστατοι/*inconsistent* with faith; but not likewise legitimate *rationcinations*, which are subject to revelation, and are used to explain and apply it rightly. Therefore, it is the Fallacy of division. 2. In the latter passage, Paul does not condemn true *Philosophy* considered in itself, but *vain* and false *Philosophy*, which was among the Philosophers of that age, by which the doctrine of the Gospel was corrupted: α. For he calls it κενὴν ἀπάτην, *vain deceit*, but not all *Philosophy* is *seducing*. β. He sets forth an example of this sort of *seducing doctrine*, mentioning θρησκείαν τῶν ἀγγέλων, *the worship of angels*, verse 18, which is not a dogma of true *Philosophy*. γ. Paul similarly condemns πιθανολογίαν, *persuasive speech*, verse 4, yet not all, but παραλογιζομένην, *that which beguiles*: otherwise, Paul himself was making use of πιθανολογία, *persuasive speech*, 2 Corinthians 5:11, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, *we persuade men*.

Nevertheless, others side with the Anabaptists in hypothesis as far as our Consequences are concerned (while they themselves make use of Consequences, as all the former also have done and do for their own advantage): namely, the Lutherans, in the case of *Consubstantiation*; and the more recent Papists, who, so that they might more easily free themselves from our arguments, by which invincibly from the Sacred Scripture we both construct our position, and refute their errors, wanted to bind us to this, that we teach that all our dogmas are contained in the Sacred Books in

¹ A city in Poland.

just so many words, with all use of Consequences rejected: see VOETIUS' *Disputationum theologicarum*, volume I, pages 5-12, § 4 and following. The first among the Papists to have contrived this art is said to be either *Renatus Benedictus*, the Parisian Theologian;¹ or *Joannes Contierius* or *Gontierius*, a Jesuit; or *Jacobus Perronius*, Cardinal,² since hereafter he published the same, and won still greater celebrity for this method; or *Franciscus Veronius*, Jesuit,³ whom many others followed, among whom the *Fratres Walenburgii*⁴ are especially noteworthy: consult SPANHEIM'S *Stricturas ad Expositionem Doctrinæ Catholicæ Episcopi Condomiensis*, chapter I, opera, tome 3, columns 1037, 1038, 1043, and his *Exercitationem de Præscriptione in rebus Fidei*, Section I, § 2, Section VI, § 2-5, opera, tome 3, columns 1080, 1109-1111; and also BUDDEUS' *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book II, chapter VII, § 9, tome 2, pages 1274-1277. Nevertheless, more of the celebrated Papists differ, stating that that which is deduced from the Scriptures by necessary and legitimate consequences is of faith; just as BELLARMINE,⁵ among others, wrote: "Nothing is of faith, except what God through the Apostles and Prophets has revealed, or what is evidently deduced from thence." See his *libros IV de Verbo Dei*, chapter IX, tome I, *Controversiis*, column 235; and his *libros III de Justificatione*, chapter VIII, *Controversiis*, tome 4, column 1113.

1. Now, the more recent Papists twist our hypotheses concerning Scripture's Perfection, Perspicuity, and Sufficiency, as if it would thence follow that no Consequences are needful; neither does Article V of the *Confessionis Gallicanæ* maintain this, which they cite unto this end. For, when it is read there, "Sacred Scripture is the sum of all truth, and embraces whatsoever is required for the worship of God and our salvation; hence we say that it is lawful neither to men, nor even to the very Angels, to add to or take away from that Word:" indeed, the

¹ Rene Benoit (1521-1608) served Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, as her Confessor (1561-1563). He advanced to the theological faculty at Paris.

² Jacques Davy Duperron (1556-1618) was a French cardinal. By his learning, eloquence, and zeal, he did much to withstand the advance of Calvinism in France.

³ François Véron (c. 1575-1649) was a French Jesuit. He entered freely and fully into the controversy with the Protestants

⁴ Adrian and Peter von Walenburch (mid-seventeenth century) were Dutch (although working from Cologne) Counter-Reformation theologians.

⁵ Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) entered the Order of the Jesuits in his late teens. Bellarmine became one of the great theologians of his era, a Cardinal, and, after his death, a Doctor of the Church.

Perfection of the Scripture is asserted, but it is not stated that nothing is to be admitted except what is read in the Sacred Scripture in so many words; otherwise it would not have been possible to add at the end, *Also, therefore, we approve those three Symbols, namely, the Apostolic, Nicene, and Athanasian, because they are agreeable to that written Word of God.* That Article, therefore, maintains that God's *Word alone* is retained, exclusive of whatever traditions; but it does not restrict us to the express word, exclusive of consequences.

2. Superciliously they also oppose the *obvious Defects in our Consequences*, especially of the *Authority of interpretation*, which they elicit from 2 Peter 1:20, *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*, *all prophecy of Scripture is not of private interpretation.* *Response:* But *Interpretation* is able to be called *private* either subjectively or originally. With respect to the former sense, Peter is not able to be understood to withdraw from all *private* men the right of interpreting Sacred Scripture; since elsewhere is commanded to the same the searching of the Scriptures,¹ the comparison of spiritual things with spiritual,² to prophesy according to the analogy of faith,³ to apply the Scripture to whatever uses:⁴ indeed, Peter himself, to confirm the truth of Apostolic doctrine, in *verse 19* immediately preceding, had sent all the faithful to the *prophetic Word*, so that by a comparison of those they might judge of the soundness of the preaching of the Apostles. Therefore, he disapproves of Interpretation, *ἐπίλυσιν*, being *private* originally, *ἰδίαν*, private and singular, which arises from the brain and will of each one, and which the words of Scripture and their comparison do not supply. Now, such an *ἐπίλυσιν*/interpretation is to be rejected, even if it proceed from the Pope himself. The truth of Consequences does not depend upon the Proposer, who draws the Consequences, but upon the force that is in the Consequence itself. For example, if I say: Every man is fallible; therefore, the Pope also: the latter follows of its own accord. But if even the Pope should say: Marriage is not to be entered upon, because what is in the flesh is not able to please God or to enter heaven; that Proposition shall not withstanding remain false: consult *my*

¹ John 5:39.

² 1 Corinthians 2:13.

³ Romans 12:6: "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith (κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως)..."

⁴ For example, 2 Timothy 3:16, 17.

Commentarium ad 2 Peter chapter 1.

§ 30: Defense of Discursive Theology

The remaining Defects of Consequences, which our AUTHOR mentions in § 30, are under no pretense attributed to our Consequences more than to theirs.

For example, *it is Objected*, 1. *that Consequences are nowhere Revealed, nor found, in Sacred Scripture.* Response: α . Certain Consequences, and indeed many, are certainly found there, examples of which we produced above from Matthew 23, etc. And in passages of this sort, in which certain Consequences are *explicitly* revealed, the foundation of Faith is twofold; one in the Consequence, the other in that from which the Consequence is derived. β . But the Consequences that we derive, if they are going to be legitimate, ought to be contained, although not explicitly, yet *implicitly*, in the Sacred Scripture. Consequences either are able to be regarded *materially*, as the doctrines themselves indicated, having been derived through the consequences; or are able to be taken *formally* according to the very connection of the terms; just as AUGUSTINE, in book II, *de Doctrina Christiana*, chapter XXXI, *opera*, tome 3, column 29, distinguished between the *truth of the sentences* and the *truth of the connections*.¹ In the former manner, the Consequences are revealed and read in the Sacred Scripture, but not in the latter: and this is sufficient.

Objection 2: that Consequences depend upon the principium of Reason, which is fallible. Response: 1. The *foundation* is one thing, upon which something depends; the *instrument* is another, of which we make use to acquire knowledge of that thing for ourselves. But Reason here is only the instrument to derive Consequences, not the foundation on which they depend. Thus, when I demonstrate the Divinity of Sacred Scripture from the Marks Inscribed with the help of ratiocination, that Divinity cannot be said to be founded on Reason, or to depend upon Reason: it is founded on the Sacred Scripture itself, and those Criteria are of themselves in the Scripture; but only by the help of Reason are they

¹ In order for an argument to be sound, it must not only be formally valid, but its premises must also be true (*the truth of the sentences*), necessitating the truth of the conclusion. However, an argument may be formally valid (*true with respect to the connections*), but unsound, because it contains one or more false premises.

known by us, and drawn out of the Sacred Books. Thus, when I believe what I see, that truth does not depend upon my sight; but upon the nature and existence of the thing itself, which, except it exist, I would not be able to discern it; and so sight is only an instrument through which I know. 2. Neither is Reason always and in all fallible; not if, illuminated by the Holy Spirit, it follow the leading of Scripture, and derive Consequences immediately founded on eternal truths.

Objection 3: that Reason is blind. Response: We speak of Reason illuminated by the Holy Spirit, whose grace, illuminating and sanctifying, removes both the Blindness of Reason, and its conflict with Revelation.

Objection 4: that the multitude does not grasp consequences. Response: Our AUTHOR rightly affirms that *this is false concerning legitimate and immediate Consequences, which Natural Logic teaches all:* so, if in order to prove that the twelfth hour has already passed, or that the third hour has not yet come, one shall make use of this argument, that it is now the second hour; even the simplest rustic shall be able to apprehend the tie between those two truths.

Objection 5: The Conclusion in a Syllogism follows the Weaker proposition; Therefore, the Conclusion shall always follow Reason and be fallible: since in the deriving of Consequences the second of the Premises is sought from Reason. Response: 1. This is an abuse or false application of a familiar Logical Canon. For, when Logicians say, *The Conclusion follows the Weaker proposition;* they do not have regard unto the matter of the Syllogism, but unto the *form*, and indeed to the *mode*, or quantity and quality of the Propositions. Therefore, this is not to be explained of a Syllogism that has one Proposition from Sacred Scripture, and the other sought from Reason: but to the universality or particularity of the Propositions, which is called the *quantity* of the Syllogism; likewise to the Assertions affirmatively or negatively set forth, which is called the *quality* of the same, does this Canon have regard, and it signifies, that if a Proposition be negative or particular, which sort is called *Weaker* than one affirmative or universal, a Conclusion negative or particular also follows, according to the verse,

If what goes before is particular, a particular Conclusion follows.

If anything was negated, let the Conclusion also be negated.

2. Otherwise by *Philosophers* a Proposition that depends upon *authority* might be called *Weaker*, than one that depends upon *reason*; for a

Proposition depending upon authority, although altogether certain, yet is *inevident*. And hence Theological Consequences also are everywhere called *inevident*, because they are principally proven by authority, with an argument from testimony and without proof; not by demonstration, with an argument with proof.

Objection 6: There is an Abuse of Consequences. Response: That does not take away the Use; otherwise the use of the Sacred Scripture would have to be condemned also, because heretics abuse the same. Many are mistaken in distinguishing various objects by Sight; yet not on account of that is it to be said that all things are uncertain that are apprehended through Sight: some are attracted to various sins through Sight, but the use of Sight is not therefore to be abrogated.

§ 31: Consequences of Theology and of Faith?

In passing, our AUTHOR here repudiates the distinction between Conclusions *Theological* and *of Faith*.

That is, they distinguish, 1. between *Conclusions Theological* and *of Faith*: 2. they call the former *Deduced*, the latter *Express*: 3. they attribute the former to the *industry of Private individuals*, the latter to the *authority of the Church*. But, 1. that which is formally Theological is drawn from the fount of Sacred Scripture, and to that extent is of Faith: therefore members of this distinction are not legitimately opposed one to another. 2. With equal absurdity would you speak of some Conclusions *Deduced*, others *Express*: for what is *expressed/extracted* from certain principia is also *deduced* from them, and vice versa. 3. Finally, the condition of the one drawing the conclusion does little to change the nature of the Conclusion, and to augment or diminish its force; but rather the legitimate and evident tie of the middle term with the end terms¹ is to be attended to.

However, no one would want to deny: 1. that some Theological Conclusions are of the *necessity of Faith*, the rejection of which gives birth to heresy, if those Conclusions proceed legitimately: others are only *of the fullness of Faith*, which are rejected, never without error, but not always with heresy. 2. That some are *proximate, immediate*, derived by manifest consequence, which, with the truth of the Premises admitted, are not able to be rejected; others are *more remote, mediated*, not so clearly proceeding, which make a lesser impression upon the mind: and it is certain that opposition is made to the latter with less danger than to the former.

But it is hardly to be doubted, that this distinction was devised in the schools of the Papists especially for this *Purpose, that they might make less of their own disputes on many heads of significant weight*, and introduce a certain, perpetual Skepticism in as many matters as possible. So, when they dispute among themselves whether Blessed Mary was preserved

¹ The major and minor terms, which appear in the conclusion, are sometimes called the *end terms*.

from contracting original Sin, which the Minorites¹ affirm and the Dominicans deny: whether the Cross is to be adored with Latria,² which Thomas determines, but Bellarmine does not dare to assert and judges to be dangerous: whether the Infallibility of the Church resides in the Pope, as the Jesuits affirm, or in a universal Council, as the Theologians of the Sorbonne prefer: and in six hundred others: they say that these Controversies are *Theological*, not *of Faith*, and in which, without danger of heresy or error in Faith, it is lawful to each to think as he will.

¹ That is, the Franciscans.

² In Roman Catholic theology, *dulia* is a degree of reverence/worship that might be extended to saints and angels; *latria* is reserved for the Divine Trinity alone, and by extension the Eucharist.

§ 32: The Unique Principia of Theology

After viewing the Genus of Revealed Theology, its *Difference* from *other Doctrines* or disciplines follows, which is first sought *from the Principium* of Theology, which our AUTHOR discusses positively and negatively in § 32 and 33.

God is said to be Theology's *Principium Essendi*, *principium of being*, that is, constituting it *extrinsically*: while the *intrinsically* constitutive *Principia Essendi* are the parts of which the whole consists; in which respect the individual Heads, which Theology treats, constitute the Theological System itself. But the *Principium Cognoscendi*, *principium of knowing*, Theology is the *Revelation* of God. The *Principia Essendi* are also said to be *simple*: the *Principia cognoscendi* on another account are called *complex*. Now, in all disciplines their *complex* *Principia* ought to be propositions of incontestable truth, or from evident reason; or, as in Theology, by the authority of *Revelation*. See MARESIUS' *Systema Theologicum*, locus I, § 23; DILHERR'S¹ *Disputationum Academicarum*, tome 2, *Disputation XVII*, pages 490 and *following*.

Consequently, *in the first place*, every *human Word*, as such, and destitute of the authority of the Scriptures, is here excluded. Here, the matter is between us and the *Papists*, who in addition to the divine Word relate several other *Principia* of Theology: *Bellarmino*, in his tomes of *Disputationum*, and others enumerate four besides the Scripture; *Traditions*, *Councils*, the *Fathers*, and *natural Reason*: see HEINRICH ALTING'S *Theologiam problematicam novam*, locus II, *problem I*, pages 71 and *following*. Concerning *Traditions* we are going to consider in *Chapter II*, § 28, 29. Unto a human Word, as such not to be held as a *Principium* of Revealed Theology, our AUTHOR refers the *Decrees of Synods*, the *Symbols* and *all Symbolical Formulas*; which, nevertheless, he does not at all wish to be despised, 1. on account of reverence for the Learned, 2. even more, on account of the preservation of the Unity of order and of

¹ Johannes Michael Dilherr (1604-1669) was a Lutheran scholar, pastor, and theologian. He served in a variety of academic posts in Jena: Professor of Rhetoric (1631-1634), of History and Poetry (1634-1640), and of Theology (1640-1642). He is remembered, not only for his learning and preaching, but also for the composition of more than sixty hymns.

doctrine, 3. most of all, on account of the their agreement with the Scriptures, an agreement recognized by the members of the Church. These Formulas of Union or Symbolical Books of the Churches are not formally to be regarded as the *Rule of Faith*, except to the extent that they materially exhibit the very Word of God: but they are more an ὑποτύπωσις ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων, *form of sound words*,¹ a voucher and Confession of our faith; bonds of Love, by which we willingly confess that we are mutually conjoined with one another in the unity of the Faith, and by the help of which the well-ordered frame of the Church more easily stands firm. But as bonds of the Conscience they are not at all able to be considered, since no one is bound to receive and admit Formulas of this sort, except he that is deeply persuaded in Conscience that those Formulas thoroughly agree with the Word of God: and when he afterwards begins to suppose otherwise, it remains free to him to divorce himself from such a Formula, and to resign from the communion of that assembly, in which the same is influential. And so we leave to *Arminius* the unjust judgment that he bears concerning the use of the Symbolical Formulas in our Reformed Church, writing to *Joannes Drusius*,² April 6, 1608, which Epistle is found in *Epistolis præstantis Viri Limburgii*, CXV, “*Joannes Acronius*,³ with *Sibrandus Lubbertus*⁴ and *Bogerman*,⁵ is among the principal men that wish to obtrude some other norm, whether under the title of a secondary norm, or under another title, upon the Church of Christ, than that one comprehended in the books of the Old and New Testaments; namely, Confessions and Catechisms, as written by learned Men, approved by various courts, confirmed by length of time (for the prescription of forty years begins to

¹ 2 Timothy 1:13.

² *Joannes Drusius* (1550-1616) was a Protestant scholar; he excelled in Oriental studies, Biblical exegesis, and critical interpretation. He served as Professor of Oriental Languages at Oxford (1572), at Louvain (1577), and at Franeker (1585).

³ *Joannes Acronius* (1565-1627) was a German Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1617-1619). He was sent as a delegate to the Synod of Dort, at which he worked with some zeal against the Remonstrants.

⁴ *Sibrandus Lubbertus* (c. 1556-1625) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1585-1625), and was a prominent participant in the Synod of Dort.

⁵ *Johannes Bogerman* (1576-1637) was a Frisian Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Franeker (1633-1637). He was involved in the production of the Dutch Bible, and was president of the Synod of Dort.

advance), reinforced by the blood of the martyrs, as traditions, according to the standard of which the Scriptures are obliged to be explained; which they are not ashamed to prescribe to the Churches and their Ministers.” Adding: “Finally, to what place shall we go, if just after the beginning of the Reformation we relapse unto the Papistical manner of acting?” see HEINRICH ALTING’S *Theologiam problematicam novam*, locus II, problem IV, pages 86-90; TRIGLAND’S¹ *Kerckelyke Historie*, volume 3, pages 358, 359, in which he treats of the Assembly preparatory to the convocation of the National Synod, held at the Hague² in 1607, while in *Kerckelyke Historie*, volume 3, pages 349-389, 391-395a, he prolixly weighs the opinion of the Arminians, who were sharply urging a Revision of the Formulas of Union in the National Synod next to be held: add *Kerckelyke Historie*, volume 3, pages 437-440, compared with page 192. The use of unifying Formulas, which sort obtain in our Churches, is most excellently defended against the Arminians and those Arminianizing in this manner in *t’ Examen van ’t Ontwerp van Tolerantie etc.*, part 8, pages 59-136. Consult Chapter XXXIII, § 20, 26 below.

In the second place, our AUTHOR removes from the Principium of Theology *all authority of the Fathers or of Philosophers*. The Principium of Theology is to be distinguished from the Arguments confirming Theological truths. The Principium of Theology is the Word of God alone. But, although the Arguments for Theological truths primarily and irrefragably are also to be sought from Sacred Scripture as the sole, indubitable norm of Faith; nevertheless arguments, probable and *ad hominem*, are able secondarily and superabundantly to be added sometimes from the consent of the Father and of sober Philosophy.

Moreover, as the *Fathers* were men liable to error, and not enjoying the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, which their repeated disagreements, and their many blots and faults, sometimes not of small moment, indicate: so divine Revelation is in vain sought in their words as such. Therefore, let us not set a greater value upon their writings, than they themselves thought was to be set upon their labors, or the labors of other Fathers of an even earlier age; or than even the *Papists* nowadays attribute to them, as often as they discern that the sayings of the Fathers are not to their advantage. JEROME well says on Matthew 23:35: *What does not have its authority from the Scriptures, is with equal*

¹ That is, Jacob Trigland the Elder.

² The Hague, from 1588, served as the seat of government for the Dutch Republic.

readiness little regarded or approved. And AUGUSTINE, *Epistolis ad Hieronymum*, Epistle LXXXII, *opera Augustini ex editione Benedictinorum*, tome 2, column 144: Now, I read others [Writers not Canonical, but Ecclesiastical] according as they might be strong in holiness and doctrine, but not in such a way that I, therefore, regard it as true, because they thus thought; but because they were able to persuade me either through those Canonical authors, or by probable reason, which is not inconsistent with the truth. Neither do I judge that thou, my brother, think something else: more than that, I say, I do not believe that thou wouldst want thy books thus to be read, as if of the Prophets and Apostles: concerning the writings of which, that they are free from all error, it is criminal to doubt. Let this be far from pious humility, and truthful reflection concerning thyself. ERASMUS, *Præfatione ad Hilarium*, α. 2. verso, Whether this is pled, so that no one might think that there is anything of error in the books ancients? But he washes a brick, as they say,¹ who endeavors in this direction. This blessedness God willed to be peculiar to the divine volumes alone. Besides, there is no one, however erudite and keen-sighted, that does not slip, is not blinded occasionally: that is, so that they might remember that all are men, and are read by us with discrimination, with judgment, and at the same time with leniency, as men. LEO ALLATIUS,² *de perpetua Consensione*, book I, Chapter V, note 14, has: But the Fathers affirm this. The Fathers are not able to say what is not. BARONIUS,³ on the Year of Christ 39, note 22, column 306: Certainly no one would deny that the Acts of the Apostles by Luke is of greater credit than any authority of the ancients. Thus it may be argued here that: 1. Whoever, neither as individuals separately, nor as all conjointly, are the Principium; those are not the Principium. But the Fathers, neither as individuals separately, are the Principium; for individual Fathers are troubled with their own blemishes and errors: nor as all conjointly; for human testimony is not able to be the Principium of religion. But the consent of all the Fathers conjointly is human Testimony. Therefore, etc. 2. Whoever's testimony is mediate and true because of another, that is, because of Scripture, that neither is nor is able to be the Principium. But the testimony of the Fathers is such. Therefore, etc.: see HEINRICH ALTING'S *Theologiam problematicam novam*, locus II,

¹ That is, he wastes his effort.

² Leo Allatius (1586-1669) was a Greek theologian, and keeper of the Vatican library. He labored for union between the Greek and Roman churches.

³ Cesare Baronio (1538-1607) was an Italian Cardinal and Vatican librarian. He is remembered primarily for his work in ecclesiastical history, *Annales Ecclesiastici*.

problem I, pages 73, 74; add VOETIUS' *Disputationes* I and II, *de Patribus seu antiquæ Ecclesiæ Doctoribus, Disputationum theologicarum*, volume I, pages 75-106. That the Fathers themselves did not wish to be held as infallible Doctors or Judges of the Church, LEYDEKKER proves by many things out of their own writings, *Veritate Euangelica triumphanti*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 7, pages 143, 144; add SPANHEMIUS' *Exercitationes de Præscriptione in rebus Fidei*, Section IV, § 4, Section V, § 3, opera, tome 3, columns 1092, 1093, 1099. See this thesis, that the writings of the Fathers are not rules of Faith, but that taken from them is to be judged by Scripture, and whatever agrees with Scripture is to be accepted; but whatever is at variance with Scripture, that, with reverence, which is owed to the Fathers, preserved, is able and ought to be rejected; by many things excellently confirmed against the Papists by GERHARD, *Confessione catholica*, tome I, book I, generalis, posteriorem partem, chapter XIII, pages 549-730. It may be added also against some Anglicans, attributing too much authority to the Fathers; see BULL'S *Apologiam pro Harmonia*, section I, § 3-6, pages 5-7.

Philosophy also is able to render assistance not useless here; 1. That it might be a means both of convincing, and of preparing the Gentiles for the Christian faith; whence CLEMENT of Alexandria, *Stromata*, book I, says that it προκατασκευάζειν τὴν ὁδὸν τῇ βασιλικωτάτῃ διδασκαλίᾳ, prepares the way to the doctrine of the Kingdom, page 309, published in Paris, 1641. Ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν μὴ καταλαμβάνει ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ φιλοσοφία τὸ μέγεθος τῆς ἀληθείας, ἔτι δὲ ἐξασθενεῖ πράττειν τὰς κυριακὰς ἐντολὰς, ἀλλ' οὖν γε προκατασκευάζει τὴν ὁδὸν τῇ βασιλικωτάτῃ διδασκαλίᾳ, but, if Greek philosophy does not comprehend the magnitude of the truth, and is yet too weak to effect the Lord's commandments, then at least it prepares the way to the doctrine of the Kingdom: just as it is now also found on page 282: Προκατασκευάζει τοίνυν ἡ φιλοσοφία, προοδοποιοῦσα τὸν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ τελειοῦμενον, philosophy, therefore, goes before, preparing the one brought to perfection by Christ. Which is evident from the Pauline sermons in Acts 14 and 17, and from the writings of the Fathers against the Gentiles: whence the word of the Emperor Julian,¹ when he saw the errors of the Gentiles overthrown by Christians with the help of Philosophy and of more cultured learning, τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς

¹ Julian was Roman Emperor from 361 to 363. He is sometimes called Julian the Philosopher, but more commonly Julian the Apostate, because of his fall from the Christian religion and opposition to it.

ἀλίσκόμεθα, *we are seized by our wings belonging to them*; on account of which ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰουλιανὸς νόμῳ τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ἀπέτρεπε τὰ ἑλλήνων παιδεύεσθαι, *the emperor Julian by law deterred the Christians from teaching the things of the Greeks*, SOCRATES' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, book III, chapter XVI, page 189, compared with JULIAN'S *Epistolis XLII*, in *Juliani operis*, pages 422-424. 2. That it might be a testimony of general consensus in things known by nature, so that thus the truth and certitude of those things might be further confirmed from a twofold revelation, as it were. 3. That it might be an instrument for perceiving matters clearly and of ordering them rightly. 4. That the mind might be developed and prepared in inferior disciplines for the treatment and undertaking of a higher science. Nevertheless, there must ever be caution here, lest anything exceed; lest we embrace Pseudo-philosophy in the place of the true, or allow Philosophy to wander beyond the olive-trees, and to send its sickle into another's harvest. For, as the Physician does not treat Geometry, nor the Lawyer, as such, Physics; so also Philosophy ought to be contained within its own bounds, neither ought dominion ever to be committed to it in the Theological school. Let Philosophy remain the *Handmaid*, serving Theology as its *Mistress*: for the subordination of disciplines and arts according to their greater or lesser degree of dignity is not reasonably denied. But the *handmaid* always remains subject to her *mistress* with a subjection *political* and *despotic*, even if the mistress subject her own head to the handmaid to be combed and dressed: which sort of servile ministry is readily allowed to be furnished to Theology even by Philosophy and more cultured learning. Neither is it to be conceded that Philosophy, which itself directs the intellect of man in the knowledge of things, and hews out its reasoning, that Philosophy, I say, by a manifest error of reasoning might make μετέβασιν εἰς ἄλλο γένος, *a transition unto another category*. At this point, some of the *Fathers* sinned, who, passing from Gentilism and the Schools of the Philosophers into the Christian Church, and excessively enticed by the love of their Philosophy, transferred certain erroneous opinions from the same to Theology, little mindful of their own admonition concerning the casting out of Hagar.¹ The *Scholastics* sinned yet more, whose Theology, should I say, or Pseudo-Philosophy, rests more upon the testimonies of Aristotle and other Philosophers, than of the Prophets and Apostles. Others also sinned, concerning whom in the

¹ For the casting out of this *handmaid*, see Genesis 16 and 21.

next place, in which the abuse of Reason is treated. But concerning Philosophy *ψευδωνύμῳ*, *falsely so called*,¹ and carrying itself even less capably, it is rather to be said with TERTULLIAN in his *de Præscriptione adversus Hæreticos*, chapter VII, *What does Athens have to do with Jerusalem? what does the Academy have to do with the Church? what do heretics have to do with Christians? Our instruction is from the portico of Solomon, who also himself had taught that the Lord is to be sought in simplicity of heart.*² Away with those that have advanced a Stoic, Platonic, and Dialectic Christianity. While elsewhere he pronounces the *Philosophers* to be the *patriarchs of Heretics*, *adversus Hermogenem*, chapter VIII. And, that this stood in every age as the sentence of the Church, the Most Illustrious LEYDEKKER, touching upon the history of many ages, in which there were to be disputes with the Pseudo-philosophers, shows in his *Dissertatione Historico-Theologica contra Bekkerum*,³ pages 459-471, in which he praises, among others, the saying of *Luther*, advancing the Reformation, *He that wishes to be wise in Christ, let him be a fool in Aristotle*: and also the saying of *Erasmus* in his *Præfatione ad Hilarium*, who, having experienced the tyranny of the Scholastics, writes, page α. 5. verso, that *the first step of a Church falling unto worse things is when the Doctrine of Christ begins to depend upon the helps of Philosophy*. Concerning the more insolent judgment of some Philosophers concerning the Style of Sacred Scripture and the manner of propounding the matter in it, see PETRUS DINANT, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter IV, § 79, pages 731-736.

In the third place, the AUTHOR removes from the Principium of Revealed Theology *human Reason*, that is, both the first dictate of our Nature with Notions imparted to it; and all the Force of Reasoning Innate in man, of which he makes use in the knowledge of whatever things; and the Conclusions made by reasoning in conformity with the light and dictate of nature; which three thing *Röellius* thought to be

¹ See 1 Timothy 6:20: “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called (ψευδωνύμου). . .”

² Wisdom of Solomon 1:1: “Love righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth: think of the Lord with a good (heart,) and in simplicity of heart seek him.”

³ Balthasar Bekker (1634-1698) was a Dutch minister, although ultimately deposed. He was a proponent of Cartesian Rationalism, arguing that philosophy and theology must be kept in separate spheres, the former for the exploration of natural truths, and the latter for the exploration of supernatural truths of Scripture.

conjoined in this business: see *Judicium Ecclesiasticum laudatum*, chapter II, § 2.

But, just as there is wont to be error in Defect no less than in Excess, so various men have slipped to either side of the footpath of truth. In Defect the *Fanatics* and *Enthusiasts* err, in particular some *Weigelians* and *Anabaptists*, who for the most part boast of internal inspirations and Revelations of the Holy Spirit, through which they may learn all things, and also understand the divine oracles without the helps of human instruction and philosophy; and at the same time they appear to have declared war on all Philosophy and liberal arts: see SPANHEIM'S¹ *Vindicias Evangelicas*, locus XLVIII, opera, tome 3, columns 198-201; likewise his *Elenchms Controversiarum cum Enthusiastis et Anabaptistis*, § XVII, opera, tome 3, column 791. Consult DORESLAER and AUSTRO-SYLVIIUS, *contra Anabaptistas*, chapter XVI, § I, pages 385, 386, 390, 392-405. Modestly, and to that extent not poorly, ENGEL ARENDSZOOM VAN DOOREGEEST² expresses this opinion, in his *Epistola ad Spanhemium*, pages 82, 83, with whom join VAN HUIZEN, cited by DE STOPPELAAR in his *notis ad Stapferi Theologiam polemicam*, chapter XVIII, § 128, 129, pages 152, 153. That the opinion of the *Anabaptists* changed for the better in this matter during this stretch of time, MOSHEIM³ also observes in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, book IV, *Sixteenth Century*, section III, part II, chapter III, § 19. See below in Chapter II, § 30, 31. Various *Lutherans* take a similar position in the Eucharistic controversy; see ECKHARDUS' *Fasciculum Controversiarum cum Calvinianis*, chapter I, question 1, pages 1-13, in which, nevertheless, various things also occur, which are of merit: and also the *Papists*, who deny that Reason is to be heard in the mysteries of faith, and repudiate its testimony, when it shows that Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, and the Ubiquity of the Body of Christ, are impossible and contradictory.

Against whom we acknowledge a manifold Use of *Reason* in Theology:

1. *Ministerial*, and that threefold,

α. *Illative in the deriving of Consequences*, which has

¹ That is, the Younger.

² Engel Arendszoon van Dooregeest (1645-1706) was a Mennonite minister and apologist.

³ Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1693-1755) was a German Lutheran ecclesiastical historian.

already been treated in § 29, 30, when from the things that we read we also understand many things that are not found expressly in Sacred Scripture. Neither ought the Reason of those truths, which are elicited by illation and legitimate Consequence from the Sacred Scripture, to be called the principium, foundation, or norm, which is the Word of God alone: Reason is only the instrument of knowing, which is able to be compared with the *eye* and the *hand* concurring, in which the things, which we wish to weigh or measure, we estimate at the public balance or span.

β. *Collative in the comparing among themselves*, of various passages of Scripture, the New Testament with the Old; of heads of Theological doctrine, lest we prophesy at any time contrary to the ἀναλογίαν πίστεως, *analogy of faith*;¹ of diverse editions and Codices, when the Reading is found to vary; of similar or dissimilar phrases, which contribute much to the illustration of the text. Various versions are also able to be compared with the original text, the inspection of which ought never to be neglected by the Theologian; the doctrine of the Church ought always to be compared with the Word of God, and also spurious doctrines, which are obtruded upon the Church by men of depraved character, etc.

γ. *Illustrative, in the greater light brought to sacred things by the comparison just now named, and the further comparison of foreign histories* also and of the liberal arts or whatever philological and philosophical disciplines, Grammar, Rhetoric, various Languages, Logic, Physics, Metaphysics, Pneumatics, Ethics, etc.: compare below, Chapter II, § 45. Indeed:

2. We concede to Reason one *Principal Use* more in Theology, α. *In the further placing together of Doctrines, which, having been believed on account of the Revelation of God, are also known from nature*, of which sort are, as examples, the Existence of God, diverse Attributes of Him, the Creation of the World, and the Conservation of the same, etc. β. Likewise in the *Refutation of Errors contrary to nature as well as to Revelation*, of which sort are the Ubiquity of Christ's Body, Eucharistical Transubstantiation, the eternity of the World, etc.: for in both of these cases Reason is able to supply *secondary* arguments, after the likeness of auxiliary troops, which are called from elsewhere to bring aid; both so that *with respect to us* the things revealed might be more powerfully

¹ Romans 12:6.

bound; and so that adversaries all the more confounded, when we show to the eye that those things, which they try to obtrude as revealed, are not only repugnant to Sacred Scripture, but are also opposed to the very light of Reason and common sense. γ. For a more principal Use of Reason also is able to be *the demonstration of the Possibility or Probability of the highest Mysteries*, for example, when the *Possibility* of the Resurrection of the Body with the same appearance and number I demonstrate from the Power of God, by which formerly He produced all things from nothing by Creation; and I support the *Probability* of the same from the Justice of God, both a rewarder of the good, and an avenger of the evil: but, since in this life God does not always recompense to man according to his work, it is probable that that awaits man in another life: and, since the Body, just like the soul, sins, exerts itself in Sanctification, is liable to sufferings; the Body also probably ought to be made a partaker of Reward, which is not able to happen without the Resurrection of the same. For the sake of illustration, various similarities occur in nature, both of seeds, and of plants, first dying, then, with life received anew, as it were, reviving more lushly. That thus the greatest Mysteries of the Creation, of the Simplicity of the divine Essence, of the Incarnation, of the Trinity, are rendered more probable, and that those things are apprehended to be not so foreign to Reason, if only we would apply ourselves with reason, observes STEPHANUS GAUSSENUS,¹ *Theses Theologicæ inaugurales*, 16-20, pages 379-382. Nevertheless, that philosophizing here is to be done with great sobriety, he admonishes and shows, *Thesibus Theologicis*, 90-92, pages 470-472.

Now, such approval of Revealed doctrine from Nature also, and demonstration that Revelation teaches nothing impossible or irrational, or contrary to natural light; is pre-eminently useful among men not yet acknowledging the truth of divine Revelation in the Sacred Books.

Now, it is easily proven that Reason and Philosophy are admitted subordinately to Theology, most agreeably to these uses: 1. *From the example of θεοπνεύστων/God-inspired Men*, who everywhere reason, when they teach the Mysteries of the faith; neither do they neglect Grammatical observations, Galatians 3:16; they make suitable use of Rhetorical elegancies and figures; from physical and domestic things they select parables to illustrate spiritual things, Matthew 13; 20;

¹ Etienne Gausсен (died 1675) was a French Reformed Theologian. He served at Saumur as Professor of Logic and Metaphysics (1661-1664), then as Professor of Theology (1664-1675).

22; 25; etc.; they make use of arguments *ad hominem*, 1 Corinthians 15:29; they show from nature also the probability of the doctrines of the faith, and the possibility of the same, 1 Corinthians 15:35-42; etc.: 2. *From the practice of the Learned of every age*: 3. *From the most precious gift of Reason, by no means given in vain*: 4. *Indeed, both from the Judging and Searching commanded*, 1 Corinthians 10:15; 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1; John 5:39; Acts 17:11, which commandments are not able to be fulfilled without the intervening use of Reason: and, 5. finally, if the testimony of the Senses is not to be altogether rejected in matters of faith, as it shall be plain below in this same section, therefore neither the testimony of Reason; because Sense is far inferior to Reason.

But others err here no less dangerously in Excess; namely, the *Socinians*, who, so that they might more easily deny the Mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Satisfaction of Christ, and other things that are most clearly revealed in the Scriptures, contend that Reason is a norm of Religion and of things to be believed, and that those things are not to be believed that might appear to be impossible to the mind: *Ostorodus, Institutionibus, chapter VI*, “Man is not obliged to believe what reason dictates to be false.” *Ostorodus and Voidovius*¹ in *Apologia*, “But, as if Christ’s most sacred and holy religion is such that would contain things absurd and repugnant to truly sound Reason: God forbid that they should think this.” *Smalcus*,² *Disputation IV, de Justificatione contra Frantzium*:³ “For there is no particle of the Christian Religion that does not agree with Reason, and what opinion agrees not with Reason, that also is able to have no place in Theology. For *Religion* is the highest Reason and Reason itself.” At the same time, the Socinians also want to appear to admit, like *Smalcus*, *Disputation III, de Sacramento*, that certain things are delivered in the Scriptures that surpass Reason, and are nevertheless to be admitted by Reason. But according to their own corrupt Reason they call many things contrary to Reason, which are above Reason: see VOETIUS’ *Disputationum theologicarum, volume I, pages 1-5, § 1-3*; HEINRICH ALTING’S *Theologiam elenticam novam, locus II, controversy I*

¹ Andrew Voidovius (c. 1565-c. 1625) was a Socinian thinker, apologist, and missionary.

² Valentinus Smalcus (1572-1622) was a German Socinian theologian. He translated the Racovian Catechism into German (probably having had a hand in the Catechism’s original composition), and the Racovian New Testament into Polish.

³ Wolfgang Franz (1564-1628) was a Lutheran Theologian. He was Professor of Theology at Wittenberg from 1605-1628.

with the Socinians, pages 37-43.

Here the Most Illustrious HERMANN ALEXANDER RÖELLIUS is also to be remembered, who certainly extolled Reason to the heavens with excessive praises, and, although sometimes he appears to speak more modestly and to contradict himself, nevertheless he makes sufficiently clear that he slips from the common path purposely: and both Röellius and some of his disciples suspend the *Divinity of Sacred Scripture*, and, resting upon this, its *Authority*, together with the *Sense* of the words of the Holy Spirit, upon Reason; neither do they wish anything to be admitted that might be against the dictate of Reason. And hence the ἰδίᾱ/*peculiar* opinion of this Most Celebrated Man concerning the divine Generation of the Son of God is to be reckoned to have proceeded; in that, while it was not permitted to him to repudiate the Scripture as in no way divine because of this doctrine taught, it pleased him to explain it as taught in the Scriptures in this manner, that in some better way Revelation here is able to be reconciled with Reason; although thus the phrase of Scripture be excessively weakened, and thus the very Mystery appear to others as subverted. And thus *Magistracy* more than *ministry* is attributed to Reason in matters of Religion. The πρῶτον ψεῦδος, *fundamental error*, of this Most Illustrious Man appears to be that he rashly believed that a treasure of innate Ideas had been granted to man by God; whence whatever appears from a contemplation of the Ideas is to be held as an Oracle: but truly the Most Illustrious Man embraced Charcoal instead of Treasure. Would that that most illustrious Man would have always been duly mindful of those things that he observes against the Socinians with respect to the Holy Trinity, a doctrine to be received in faith because of the testimony of the God revealing, *Commentario in principium Epistolæ ad Ephesios*, verses 1-3, § 224, pages 550-553, compared with § 44, pages 107-110. Consult the writing, not easily to be praised in proportion to its merit, of the Professors of Leiden, MARCKIUS, FABRICIUS,¹ WESSELIUS, and TACO HAJO VAN DEN HONERT,² which they called *Judicium Ecclesiasticum, quo opiniones quædam Clarissimi Röellii damnatæ sunt, laudatum*, and chapter II of the same, and WEISMANN, who also sets forth this Röellian controversy with its consequences, *Historia Ecclesiastica*

¹ Franciscus Fabricius (1663-1738) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian; he served as Professor of Theology at Leiden (1705-1738).

² Taco Hajo van den Honert (1666-1740) was a German Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Leiden (1714-1740).

Novi Testamenti, part 2, Century XVII, § 29, pages 728-733.

Unto the same class of those that here err in Excess, is also to be referred the *Author of Exercitationis paradoxæ de Philosophia Sacræ Scripturæ Interprete, seu in qua veram Philosophiam Infallibilem Sacras Litteras interpretandi normam esse, apodictice demonstratur*;¹ according to which principium the Mysteries of the Trinity, of Creation ex nihilo, of the Resurrection of Bodies numerically the same, are therein rejected and openly hissed at, because they appear to be repugnant to Sound Reason and true Philosophy. Concerning which writing, the Theologians of Leiden, HEIDANUS and COCCEIUS, who alone were teaching there at that time, having been ordered by the Esteemed Lords, the Orders of Holland, to express their view in December of 1666, related these things, among others: “We condemn the perverse method proposed in this writing, that we are obliged to accept and to believe anything that, having been compared to Reason and Philosophy, is found to agree with these, and that we are obliged to reject and not to believe what might not agree with Reason: and that from this foundation, because no truth is inconsistent with itself, and nothing that is found to be true in Philosophy is able to be false in Theology. In which the writer is here discovered to follow the paths in which Socinus and others went before. Who, as this one does, on account of that method, entirely deny and take away the mysteries of the faith, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of the same Flesh, etc., because they are not able to reconcile those things with their Reason and the philosophical opinions generally stamped in their brain.” The Author of that *Exercitationis* is believed to have been *Lodewijk Meyer*, a Physician of Amsterdam, and publisher of *Posthumorum Spinosæ*: see WEISMANN’S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Novi Testamenti*, part 2, Century XVII, § 29, pages 726.

HERMAN DEUSING might yet be added, Jurisconsultus and for some time Academic Reader at Groningen, who, having fallen into Allegoromania, with another work of that sort² published in the year 1690, *Revelationem Mysteriorum Sacrosanctæ Triados*, in the preface of which he even acknowledges that he learned from a faithful Witness that in the mystery of the Trinity was found eternal life; but in which writing he

¹ *Philosophia Sacræ Scripturæ Interpres* was published anonymously, and was initially thought to be the work of Spinoza. It was actually penned by Lodewijk Meyer (1629-1681), a Dutch Enlightenment scholar and Rationalist philosopher.

² That is, *Historia Allegorica Veteris et Novi Testamenti*.

clearly perverts this most holy dogma, and urges that absolutely no mysteries are given in the Sacred Scriptures that are inaccessible or Incomprehensible to our natural Reason, or that would be sinful to be scrutinized by men. Indeed, this Writer, with SPANHEIM observing in his *Elencho Controversiarum, Opera, tome 3, columns 1006, 1007, received contempt and punishment instead of praise; with this written, in so many ways injurious to the Simplicity of the Scriptures and to the Catholic faith, by Edicts of the Nobles of Groningen to be torn up and cast away by the hands of the pious.*

On the other hand, the Theologians of Leiden, in *Judicio Ecclesiastico, chapter II, § 9*, desire that it be observed: α . That natural man is depicted to us in Sacred Scripture as foolish in the very midst of his wisdom, blind in his perspicuity, hostile in his tendency, Romans 1:21-23; 8:7; 1 Corinthians 1:20, 22; 2:14; Ephesians 4:18, 19; 5:8. β . That man, even with respect to his own wisdom, is obliged to *deny* himself, and to *submit* his reasonings to Revelation, Psalm 131:1, 2; Matthew 11:25; 16:24; 2 Corinthians 10:4, 5; Colossians 2:8. γ . That the most sublime Mysteries, inaccessible to Reason, and which only by the Revelation of God is it granted to follow, are the object of true Religion, Psalm 25:14; Proverbs 30:2, 3; Matthew 11:25; 13:11; 16:17; Romans 16:25; 1 Corinthians 2:7-9; Colossians 2:2, 3; 1 Timothy 3:16. δ . That true Religion is solely founded on special Revelation, as an altogether infallible Principium, alone and final, Psalm 119:105; Isaiah 8:20; Luke 16:29; Romans 10:17; Ephesians 2:20; 2 Timothy 3:15; 2 Peter 1:19, 20, without which Faith would not be divine, but only a human persuasion, Hebrews 11:1; Romans 4:20, 21. Indeed, if the contrary opinion stand, Faith is completely converted into philosophical Knowledge: no longer will divine Revelation, unless in this name it be pleasing to trifle, be the true, sole, and ultimate foundation or Principium of our Religion; but that Reason itself, from which Revelation receives all true Authority and Meaning; as a similar analysis of the *Papistical* Faith in the Church is deservedly made by us, upon the Testimony and Interpretation of which these cause the Scripture altogether to depend; and of the *Enthusiastical* Faith in their own private Inspirations, unto which these likewise are wont to recur in all things, with continual twisting of the most manifest Scriptures. ϵ . Finally, they wish to be observed that besides external Revelation the illumination, leading, and internal drawing of the Spirit is also necessary, Psalm 119:18; 143:10; Joel 2:28; John 16:13; 1 Corinthians 2:10-12; Ephesians 1:17; 2:8; 1 John 2:20, 27; 2 Corinthians 4:6. And thus the

most sublime Mysteries, which are learned from the *Principium* of supernatural Revelation, from the *Magistro* Holy Spirit, are the *Object* of Religion; which is not able to be reconciled with the *Magisterio* of Reason in Religion. Moreover, what things from the Formulas of Union of our Church, and also from the Articles of Peace established by the Orders of Holland in 1694, the Theologians of Leiden commend against Röellius, see *Judicium Ecclesiasticum laudatum*, chapter II, § 14, 15, after in § 13 was also commended the Decision of the Professors of Amsterdam, JOHANNES DE RAEY,¹ GERBRAND VAN LEEUWEN,² and LUDWIG WOLZOGEN, published on October 6, 1689, in which they wished to resist, and to place a bar to, the excessive authority attributed to Philosophy and natural Reason according to common counsel and consent: in which manner the last named, the Most Illustrious WOLZOGEN, in the last days of life, openly caused to be known that he repented of the error, by which he previously, in his book *de Interprete Scripturarum*, offered too much also to the authority of Reason in matters of Faith according to the opinion of a great many; consult LEYDEKKER'S *Præfationem ante Ludovici de Dieu Aphoristica Theologia*, section V, F 1-5, section VII, K 2-5; JOHANNES VAN DER WAEYEN'S and HERMAN WITSIUS' *Ernstige Betuyging aan de afdwalende Kinderen tot de Labadisten*, pages 89-100; PETRUS VAN MASTRICHT'S *Gangrænæm Novitatum Cartesianarum*, posterior Section, chapter II, § 2-12, pages 157-164, chapter III, page 196; WEISMANN'S *Historiam Ecclesiasticam Novi Testamenti*, part 2, Century XVII, § 29, pages 726-728. Join with the principal matter that we are discussing, SPANHEIM'S observation against the method of *Nicolas Steno*, Protestant turned Papist,³ of discerning the true Church *by the light of Reason alone*, in *Stricturis adversus Bossueti Expositionem Doctrinæ Catholicæ*, chapter I, opera, tome III, columns 1045, the same who in *Collegio Theologico Heidelbergæ de Principio Theologiæ*, part I, § 7, opera, tome 3, column 1189, has: "The human Reason of the Socinians is not able to be the Principium of Revealed Theology,

¹ Johannes de Raey (1622-1702) was a Dutch Reformed philosopher and disciple of Descartes. He served as Professor of Philosophy, first at Leiden (1653-1668), then at Amsterdam (1668-1702).

² Gerbrand van Leeuwen (1643-1721) was a Reformed theologian. He was Professor of Theology at Amsterdam from 1686 to 1712.

³ Nicolas Steno (1638-1686), a Dane, was raised as a Lutheran, but converted to Roman Catholicism in 1667. He was ordained, first to the office of priest, then to that of bishop, and played a significant role in the Counter-Reformation in Northern Germany.

whether that Reason be taken *subjectively* and *formally*, or *objectively* and *materially* for the axioms and propositions of reason; unless it now exceed the sphere of its activity; unless we commit μετάβασιν εἰς ἄλλο γένος, *a transition unto another category*; unless we measure heavenly things by earthly, the wisdom of God by the wisdom of the world, supernatural things by natural, indeed, unless we subject God to man, the Scripture to reason, even though the Apostle opposes, 1 Corinthians 1:18-20; 2:14; etc.” Consult also GERARDUS VAN AALST’S *Præfationem* before *Explicationem Parabolæ Satore*, *** verses 2-6; E.D.P.’S¹ *Brieven aan J.C. Voet*, part 2, letter 4, pages 143-162.

Objection 1: Truth does not contradict truth; and thus what is true Philosophically and according to the dictate of Reason, is not able to be false Theologically. *Response:* α. This is true of true Philosophy and sound Reason considered in the abstract, and indeed with respect to the objects that fall under the sphere of the activity of Philosophy and natural Reason. β. But revealed Theology far transcends Reason and Philosophy, and thus many things are posited in Theology, concerning which Reason and Philosophy are not able to judge, because they are *Above Reason*: just as the Senses do not judge concerning spiritual matters not perceived by sense; which things are not able to be said to be contrary to the Senses, but rightly indeed above the Senses. Now, the Socinians and others wrongly reject Mysteries most clearly revealed as repugnant to Reason; while they are not adverse except to corrupted Reason, but are more correctly to be said to be *above Reason*. We have only woefully inadequate and imperfect ideas of the matters that make up the substance and subject of the Mysteries; and thus we are not able to pronounce the things predicated to be false, that are attributed in the Sacred Books to subjects in this category of matters, or to pronounce that the same do not agree with their own subjects, as long as we do not have a perfect and adequate knowledge of the subjects: but, since this knowledge would not be able to be denied to the omniscient God, especially with respect to Himself, upon whom also in those things that He reveals concerning Himself Faith is to be placed. Thus you are unable to say that it is repugnant that in one Essence are posited three Persons: for how do you know whether this is repugnant to the divine Essence, when you are devoid of perfect Knowledge of God; compare Job 11:7. You are not able to say that the Resurrection of the Dead is

¹ E. D. P. (Een Duits Predikant), *a Dutch Minister*.

Impossible, since you do not know the Power of God; *πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες*—*τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *ye do err, not knowing...the power of God*, Matthew 22:29. *Δυνάμενός ἐστι ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπὲρ ἕκ περισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν*, *He is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think*, Ephesians 3:20. But, when we, being without perfect Knowledge of the matter, presume to judge of the same according the limitation of our inadequate Idea, we are in perpetual danger of mistake in our reasonings: and, since right Reason is not given in the abstract, according to which we might evaluate our reasonings, it can happen through our imperfect natural knowledge and blindness in matters of Faith, that we might especially fall from right Reason at the very time we imagine to ourselves that we proceed most thoroughly according to Reason. Consult in general the Eminent NIEUWENTYT in his *Gronden van Zekerheid*, especially part V, chapter IV, pages 407-437, in which he proluxly and eruditely shows that the Dogmas of Religion are not able to be weighed at the balance of Reason, precisely so, because the Sacred Scripture speaks *above Reason*, not *against Reason*: add STAPFER'S *Theologiæ polemicæ*, tome I, chapter III, section XII, § 981-988.

Objection 2: Paul mentions that *rational Worship* is required of us, *λογικὴν λατρείαν*, Romans 12:1. *Response:* α. *Λατρεία*/*service/worship* is able to be called *λογικὴ*/*rational/reasonable*, a. either *originally*, which is from Reason as its origin and principium: in this sense our Worship is not rational, since that verily proceeds from the principium of Revelation. b. Or *subjectively* and *instrumentally*, which is in Reason as in a subject, and is exercised through Reason as through an Instrument: and in this sense Paul calls Worship *λογικὴν λατρείαν*, *rational worship*, which is situated in Reason and is exercised through Reason, that is, which is spiritual and internal, not carnal and external. Worship that teaches to offer to God rational and spiritual sacrifices, not the sacrifices of brutes, which sort God was formerly demanding, 1 Peter 2:5. β. That *λατρεία*/*service/worship*, which Paul indicates, shall also be called *λογικὴ*/*rational/reasonable*, that is, rational to such an extent that with reason one is not able to be opposed to that: see *Judicium Ecclesiasticum laudatum*, chapter II, § 9, page 47; and add in general E.D.P'S *Brieven aan J.C. Voet*, part 2, letter 3, pages 107-136.

Objection 3: Paul by the manifestation of the truth commended himself to every Conscience of men in the sight of God, 2 Corinthians 4:2. *Response:* α. It does not follow from this that every natural Conscience is

sufficiently fit for that Manifestation, and that by Reason, of itself, and without the internal grace of the Spirit; any more than that Teachers *leading men to faith* through the proclamation of the *terror* of the Lord, according to 2 Corinthians 5:11, are able to bring it to pass without the powerful drawing of God, from a comparison with 1 Corinthians 3:7-9. β. Verses for comparison are connected in the immediate context, 2 Corinthians 4:3, 4, 6: see *Judicium Ecclesiasticum laudatum*, chapter II, § 9, page 49.

The Theological Faculty of Leiden, which at that time was made up of SPANHEIM the Younger, TRIGLAND the Younger, and MARCKIUS, in 1692, by the command of the Orders of Holland stating their opinion concerning HERMANN ALEXANDER RÖELLIUS' *Dissertatione Theologica de Generatione Filii et Morte fidelium temporali*, among other things also declared: "Worthy of careful attention is the spring and motive, by which the Author indicates that he was inducted into opinions of this sort, namely, because they appear to agree better with His Reason and human perception, asserting, § II, pages 14, 15, not without an appearance of contradiction, *that, even if it is evident that what things have been revealed by God are able and ought to be believed with a settled faith, granting that they are not able plainly, fully, and with respect to every case to be understood and perceived by us, yet nothing is able and ought to be believed, except as far as it is known, etc.*; and finishing that section with this canon, *that Never beyond perception is to be extended judgment or faith*; which perception he had previously called *clear and distinct*. Whence it would follow that the most penetrating Philosophers would also be the best disposed to faith; and that the simple and recently born infants in Christ, who little know how to reason and to perceive, would be the furthest from faith, contrary to Matthew 11:25; 1 Corinthians 2:14. In this manner, this only is established as an object of faith, what is clearly and distinctly perceived: while the Apostle, judging otherwise, in the place of this has *the Wisdom of God in a mystery, etc.*, 1 Corinthians 2:7, 8, things *which pass understanding*, Ephesians 3:19, a power and grace that *do exceeding abundantly above all that we are able to think*, Ephesians 3:20. In this way the rules of natural Knowledge are made the axioms of Holy Religion and of Christian Theology; which sort of authority, covering so wide a field, Philosophy and sober Reason never arrogated to itself. Notwithstanding, it pleases the Author frequently to set in the first place *Reason*, and then *Revelation*, as *the sole norm of faith and obedience*, § 7, page 13, etc. *The demonstration of the Divinity and sense of the divine Word*, says

he, *to the conscience, which Paul desires to be done by warning and example*, is a demonstration *to Reason*, § 8, page 13. However, when Paul speaks of his own demonstration, he calls that the ἀπόδειξιν πνεύματος, *demonstration of the Spirit*, over against σοφίαν ἀνθρωπίνην, *human wisdom*, 1 Corinthians 2:4; when he mentions the φανέρωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας πρὸς πᾶσαν συνείδησιν, *manifestation of the truth to every conscience*, he makes no mention of Reason, but *of the light of supernal knowledge in the face of Jesus Christ*, 2 Corinthians 4:2, 6. Among other reasons why this Author rejects *Proper Generation*, he alleges as one of his principal reasons, § 6, page 11, § 38, page 38, § 46, page 48, *that of this matter no one to this point himself had, or was able to give to others, any concept, much less a clear and distinct concept*. But on this basis all of the Mysteries of the Christian Faith of greatest moment and of solid consolation, for example, the Trinity, the personal Union of two natures in God the Son, the Resurrection of the body numerically the same, and many others, are able to be rejected with the same ease; since undoubtedly no one himself has or is able to give to others a clear and distinct perception of these or other Mysteries. Thus unto posterity Reason, ideas and human intellect, not only ought to be held as an Instrument by which one searches out and scrutinizes divine truths in Sacred Scripture, and also as a Means by which one knows, sets forth, and defends the same, which none of the Theologians denies; but additionally as a Rule, Norm, and Lydian Stone,¹ according to the dictate and measure of which the heads of Religion are to be accepted or rejected, and Faith stands unmoved or falls: in which manner, not only is the authentical authority of Sacred Scripture injured, but Philosophy and sober Reason never arrogated to themselves such. And just as these things recede from the opinion of the reformed Church, so they more than a little agree with some hypotheses of a well known book, which is entitled, *Philosophiæ Scripturæ Interpretis*, the assertions of which our Predecessors, Doctors of Divinity Heidanus and Cocceius, judged necessary with such zeal to represent as noxious and perverse, etc. The paternal zeal and piety of the Prepotent Orders for some time after 1656 was vigilant against opinions of this sort and the abuse of Philosophy in Theology in an edict on September 30, which contains the following things verbatim: *If some question might occur, which might be introduced as contrary to Holy Scripture, and if then the Philosophers would not submit to*

¹ A type of black stone, formerly used to test the purity of precious metals.

interpret the Holy Scriptures according to their principles, but foremost comparing them to the supreme Rule, it would show that all things are revealed to men by God through the Holy Scriptures as most sure, certain and beyond doubt: If either natural light or man's reason, however clear and obvious it might be, might seem to dictate something else, nevertheless one must attribute more faith to God's authority than to man's judgment, etc.

Against Röellius, concerning this head, JACOBUS FRUYTIER¹ argues at length in his *Zions Worstelingen 3de Samenspraken*, volume 1, pages 588-649. Concerning Naturalism, and the Abuse of Philosophy and human Reason in Theology, consult LEYDEKKER'S *Veritatem Evangelicam triumphantem*, tome I, book I, chapter V. That the Fathers were unwilling to bear the Magistracy of Reason in Theology, *Leydekker* observes in *Veritate Evangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § 9, page 146. Concerning the abuse of natural Reason in matters of Faith, see also GERHARD, disputing also against the Papists, *Confessione catholica*, tome I, book I, *generalis, posteriorem partem*, chapter XVIII, pages 795-809; whence it will be evident just how guilty the Papists are at this point, who in other circumstances in the case of Transubstantiation are unwilling to be called by us to Reason and Sense, so that more abundantly is confirmed that which otherwise is certainly sufficiently evident out of the Sacred Scripture itself. SPANHEIM'S² disputation against *Exercitatione Paradoxa*, in which *Philosophy* is stated to be the *Interpreter of Sacred Scripture*, which see in SPANHEIM'S *Elenchum Controversiarum, Opera*, tome 3, columns 999-1001: add WITSIUS' *Twist des Heeren met zynen Wyngaard*, chapter XXI, pages 281-287; and ULRICH HUBER'S³ *de Jure Civitatis*, book I, section VI, chapters I-VI; and PETRUS DINANT'S, *de Achtbaarheid van Godts Woord*, chapter II, § 64-76, pages 243-265, in which he particularly argues against those that suspend the Divinity of Sacred Scripture upon Reason. Before Röellius, DESCARTES had discernment at this point, whom it is to be desired that all his admirers had followed in this particular also. Namely, he, in *Principiorum Philosophicæ*, part I, article 76 or the last, wrote: "Now, besides these things, it is to be fixed in our memory as the highest rule, that those things that have been revealed to us by God are to be believed as the most certain of all: and that, although perhaps the light of reason,

¹ Jacobus Fruytier (1659-1731) was a Dutch Reformed pastor and theologian.

² That is, Frederic Spanheim the Younger.

³ Ulrich Huber (1636-1694) was a Dutch jurist and political philosopher. He served as Professor of Law at Franeker (1665-1679, 1683-1694).

as clear and evident as possible, appear to suggest to us something else, faith is to be applied to divine authority alone, rather than to our own judgment.” He has a good number of passages elsewhere that are consonant with this: see in general VRIESIUS’ *Exercitationes de Officio Philosophi circa Revelata*.

I am unable to conclude, without finally subjoining to these things the deep groans and sighs of our AUTHOR, which, for fear of the imminent evils of the Church from the Magistracy committed to Reason in matters of Religion, he poured forth in his *Oratione quarta post Exercitationes Miscellaneas*, held at Groningen in 1688, pages 474-477: “Why should I deny that I fear for the Netherlands, and for the Church and Reformed truth, if we embrace a common principium with the Socinians, indeed, if we commend it more than they. Our interests have fallen to such an extent that Reason, as an Oracle, infallible, to be heard and adored *with a humble and obsequious mind not otherwise than as the word of God Himself*, is set forth openly, which *it is not far from blasphemy to convict of falsehood*; and at the same time are ridiculed those that admonish out of Clement that Hagar ought to be made subject to Sarah or to be ejected.¹ We have come to such a point that there are those that defend that *those things that by reason are indubitable to us are not to be denied*, even if we are not able to reconcile those things with Scripture; that *those that, with their reason captivated, believe the Scripture are become beasts*; that *Theologians that, finding themselves to be no match for reasons, invoke the Scripture for help act incorrectly*; that reason is not to be reconciled with Scripture, but *Scripture with reason*; that *secure philosophizing is a must, and concerning the rest one must sleep idly upon either ear*;² that the infallibility of Reason is to be embraced, so that the *authority* of Scripture might be certain, because *this is not able to be constructed from any other source than Reason*. The Doctors have advanced to such a point that they hold Reason *to be the sole principium of all truth*; that all *love of God, reverence, obedience, and faith is derived from this source, and ought to be reduced to it*; that *here, and not elsewhere, the hope of blessedness finds its sacred anchor*; that *in fact, if even a bit be added to or subtracted from the dictate of Reason, its authority is injured*. Why are you astonished, as if you have not confidence in the narrator? You have undoubtedly read, or you all are able to read, almost all the words which I have recited, very recently

¹ *Stromata*, book I, pages 284, 285.

² Terrence’s *The Self-Tormenter*, act 2, scene 2, line 101. It is a proverbial expression denoting a resting in security.

written, and have known those that foster these hypotheses in their souls, and from time to time speak similar things. But it is better that you be astonished at me, than that Socinian principia be heard in the Reformed Schools without restraint, the hurt of which the Church shall hereafter lament sooner or later. For you will not be able to give to me, nor I to name, anyone from the impure flock that might not speak more reverently concerning Revelation, and more modestly concerning Reason. But even now the pious lovers of truth are able to understand, indeed, all that do not close their eyes in the midst of light, what unwholesome fruit that bitter root of Reason will bear. *The Christian Religion, before its truth is made evident by particular and most certain arguments* (how many and who, I ask, of children, foolish women, and private men, arrive at that?), is said to be held in no better position than the Turkish, or Pagan, or Jewish. The single Omnipresence of God is learned from the chimeras of the Scholastics, and is a fictitious attribute; the simplicity of God is called into doubt; the liberty of God and the eternity of the Decrees of God are set against each other; arguments for Deity, if they be disjoined from our idea of God, are invalid; miracles are attributed to natural causes; rational creatures are judged to be masters of their own actions; nothing ought to be placed outside of the will that might determine it; the working of God is not to be conceived by way of predetermination; the mysteries of the Trinity and of the Incarnation are to be removed from the fundamentals; the corruption of the human nature does not pertain to the mind or its faculties, but to its use, act and habit; the activities of angels, by which their existence was most forcefully demonstrated from the earliest times, are fabricated fables; the state of souls is changed in death, but they do not exchange the dwelling of earth with heaven; a disputation is brought against the infernal region, neither from any appearance of truth is it thought to be unsuitable that after the day of judgment the impious are going to dwell on this earth, and perhaps are going to abound in external goods. Rejoice, ye impious, and let *Epicurus* be held as vile among you, who did not promise such things. But what do these and all similar things elicit from me and from all good men, except the most ardent sighings after God, that He might be willing to take pity on Zion, and to attend upon His own glorious name; except supplications to you, Most Distinguished Nobles, that you from your seats of authority might prevent the tyranny of proud reason; except fraternal rousings to you, Most Illustrious Colleagues and Reverend Co-laborers in the Lord, that we might together oppose the

advancing madness, etc.” Concerning the use and abuse of Philosophy and Reason in Theology, see also BUDDEUS’ *Isagogen ad Theologiam universam*, book I, chapter IV, § 23, 24, tome I, pages 234-240.

In the fourth place, and finally, the *Testimony of the Senses* is excluded from the Principium and Foundation of Theology, from which, on the other hand, we are not willing to remove all Use in matters of Theology and of Faith with the *Papists*, who, so that they might obviate the argument that we aim at to impugn Transubstantiation and the carnal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and to confirm the reality of the Substance of the bread and wine, from the Testimony of the Senses; say that the Testimony of the Senses is not to be received in the Mysteries of the Faith, because the Mysteries are above Sense, and Faith is posited in this, that we believe what we do not see.¹

And we know how to distinguish between *Sense*, *Reason*, and *Faith*, and we assign to each one of these faculties its proper object, concerning which it is conversant, that is, matters αἰσθητὰς/*sensible*, νοητὰς/*mental*, and πιστὰς, *to be believed*, which, as they ought not to be confounded, neither are they to be opposed to each other. Therefore, it is not asked whether nothing ought to be admitted except what the Senses are able to receive; for many things have been revealed to us unto which Sense is not able to rise: but, when the senses judge concerning their proper object, and pass not beyond their sphere, it is asked whether their Testimony is to be rejected in Theology; or, whether Faith be opposed to well-ordered judgment of the Senses, and overturn that judgment? *This we deny*. We distinguish also between Mysteries purely spiritual and exceeding all our capacity, of which sort are the Trinity, the Generation of the Son, etc.: and the Mysteries which are situated in matters sensible and corporeal; whether God makes use of those as means to accomplish His decrees, or He wills through them to lift us to a clearer knowledge of the more sublime Mysteries, of which sort are the miracles of Christ, the types of the Old Testament, the Sacraments of the New Testament. In Mysteries of the latter sort, in which a spiritual thing is joined with a corporeal, a Mystery is revealed indeed, and it remains the object of Faith, but the corporeal thing entering the Mystery is also the object of Sense. At this point it is asked whether Faith makes use of the testimony of the Senses, or rejects it, in corporeal matters, for example, when it judges of the substance of the bread and wine in the

¹ Hebrews 11:1.

Eucharist and of the absence of the Body of Christ?

That the Testimony of the Senses in cases of this sort is not entirely to be rejected, it is evident: 1. Because God makes use of this means to engender Faith, Romans 10:14, 17; whence, not only is the use of this means proven, but hence also it is apparent that the Senses are not in all things and always fallible; for otherwise this means would not be suitable to engender certain knowledge. 2. The sacred text seeks arguments from the Senses to confirm Theological truths, of which sort, for example, is the Resurrection of Christ, which is confirmed by the testimony of sight, Matthew 28:6, of sight and touch together, Luke 24:39; *Peter* appeals to the seeing and hearing of Christ's glory, 2 Peter 1:16-18; *John* appeals to hearing, seeing, and touching together in matters regarding the economy of Christ, 1 John 1:1. Now, 3. the Faithfulness of God does not allow us to believe that He has willed to make sport of men, by sending them to testimony, which was designed as uniquely apt to cheat and to deceive.

Objection: The Senses are able to deceive. *Response:* Yet they do not always and in all things deceive; and at this point to guard against error it is required, 1. that the object be at an appropriate distance; 2. that the medium be pure and free from all that which might be able to spoil the mental image; 3. that the organ be rightly disposed; 4. that all the Senses that are able to examine a certain object be consulted and make the same judgment; 5. that Senses act attentively and not precipitantly; 6. that the fancy be free, and that frenzy and fever be not present: for otherwise it happens that we believe that we see or hear those things, which nevertheless we do neither see nor hear. Now, all these conditions concur in the Testimony of our Senses concerning the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist. Consult VRIESIUS' *Dissertationem de Sensuum usu in Philosophando*, § 16-18, 27-37; 'S GRAVEZANDE'S¹ *Introductionem ad Philosophiam*, book II, part I, chapter XIV, pages 149-163; and below in this work, Chapter XIII, § 16.

¹ Willem Jacob 's Gravesande (1688-1742) was a Dutch lawyer and natural philosopher.

§ 33: Modes of Revelation

Moreover, it remains that the Revealed Word of God alone is the Principium and foundation of Revealed Theology: 1. For in this very thing *Revealed Theology* is distinguished from other disciplines, and in species is set over against *Natural Theology*, that it is sought from *Revelation*; without which it would not be able to be called *Revealed Theology*. 2. The Truths that Revealed Theology delivers we are constrained to embrace *by Faith*; which, if it shall be rightly constituted, and a *Faith divine*, not human, requires a Principium and foundation *infallible* and *authentic*, which is the Revelation of God alone: see HEINRICH ALTING'S *Theologiam problematicam novam*, locus II, *problem* I, pages 69-71; and this work below, *Chapter* II, here and there, but especially in § 32. That the Fathers of the Ancient Church thought the same, LEYDEKKER observes in his *Veritate Evangelica triumphante*, tome I, book I, chapter XII, § I, pages 135, 136.

That for this reason this was from the beginning in the imitation of Satan, adds our AUTHOR: that is, because all by nature had a persuasion from the beginning that the true knowledge of Religion and the right method of worshipping God is to be traced from the Revelation of it; that hence impostors, about to deliver a form of Religion, feigned Interviews with Divinities and Angels, as Lycurgus with Apollo, Minos with Jove, Numa with the nymph Ægeria, Muhammad with Gabriel: but also the Devil was able through ψεύδους/*lying* Oracles so much more easily to bewitch the Gentile world: compare § 23 above, and *Chapter* IX, § 3, 8, 26 below.

Now, of this divine Revelation our AUTHOR surveys, α. the various Modes, β. the Means of differentiating the Word divinely Revealed from another that is not such.

α. That Revelation was formerly given by God, not only πολυμερῶς, *at sundry times*, but also πολυτρόπως, *in diverse manners*, Paul acknowledges in Hebrews 1:1. God gave it:

⌘. *Either through the intervening ministry of Angels*, Daniel 9:21, etc.; Luke 1:11, 13, 19, 26, 28, 30, etc.; Matthew 2:13, in which is the appearance of the Angel of the Lord to Joseph κατ' ὄναρ, *in a dream*.

ב. Or without intervening ministers of this sort, whether, *a.* God manifested Himself to the external Senses; and that, 1. either to the sight and hearing at the same time, when He *appeared in an assumed corporeal form*, Genesis 18:17; or, 2. without a corporeal representation of this sort to the hearing alone *through Sonorous Voice*, 1 Samuel 3:10. *b.* Or He revealed Himself to the internal Imagination, and that, 1. to those awake, *through a Vision* of the thing to be known, exhibited to holy men carried into *Ecstasy*, 1 Kings 22:19; Acts 10:10-17; 2. or to those sleeping, by affecting the fancy *in a Dream*, no less vividly than if one being awake should hear the voice of God and see visions of Him, Genesis 28:12; 37:5, etc.; Job 33:14, 15; Daniel 7:1, etc; Acts 16:9. *c.* Or even without affected sense or imagination, in a mode especially spiritual, He blessed Men of God with Revelation *through the internal illumination of the Mind* only, 2 Samuel 23:2, 3; Matthew 10:19: see WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapters III-VI.

The various Modes of Revelation are enumerated together in Numbers 12:6-8. God affirms that commonly He is going to appear to the Prophets, either, 1. *while awake*, בִּמְרֹאָה, *through a vision*, symbolical and enigmatical, or, 2. *while sleeping*, בַּחֲלוֹם, *through a dream*. Then God makes mention of, 3. addressing them בְּחִידֹת, *through dark speeches*, in which is depicted something other than what is to be understood, for example, when Ezekiel is commanded to eat a book, Ezekiel 3:1-3; when he is commanded to lie on his side for three hundred and ninety days, and also to eat bread with cow's dung, Ezekiel 4:5, 15. To this Revelation *by enigmas* is opposed, 4. another מְרֹאָה / *appearance* attributed to Moses, which two things in other places are not to be considered opposites, but here in opposition to enigmas the *Appearance* granted to Moses may indicate a *vision clear* and distinct, of the very things, as if presented face-to-face. 5. The תְּמִנַּת יְהוָה, *the similitude of the Lord*, is similar, which Moses *was regarding*; it is denied that the Isrealites saw this at Mount Sinai, Deuteronomy 4:12: it denotes, not the very essence of God, but a certain extraordinary radiance of divine splendor, perhaps shining in human appearance, which Messiah at length assumed. 6. Also this was Moses' special privilege, that God spoke with him mouth-to-mouth, פֶּה אֶל-פֶּה אֲדַבֵּר-בּוֹ. It differs little from that which is in Exodus 33:11, וַדַּבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל-מֹשֶׁה פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים, etc., *and the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, etc.*; to which is similar what is narrated concerning the whole

people, Deuteronomy 5:4, פָּנִים בְּפָנִים דִּבֶּר יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם, *the Lord talked with you face to face*. Concerning Moses, it, received and related as among his privileges, shall have a notable emphasis, and shall signify that God immediately, but also most familiarly, entered into a give and take with Moses, unto which Moses might attend with great παρρησία/*freedom*, without immoderate perturbation or horror of mind. It is similar, what you read in Jeremiah 32:4, in which Zedekiah, King of Judah, is mentioned as about to be delivered in the hand of the King of Babylon, וְדִבֶּר-פִּי עִם-פִּי, *and he shall speak with him mouth to mouth*, that is, face-to-face, that with his own eyes he might look upon his face: consult WITSIUS' *Miscellaneorum sacrorum*, tome 1, book I, chapters VII, § 1-8; CARPZOV'S¹ *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*, chapter I, § 7, 16-19. Verse 8 of Numbers 12 is interpreted somewhat differently by the Most Illustrious WESSELIUS in his *Dissertationibus Leidenibus* V, § 8, pages 180-182; whether his exegesis is to be preferred, the judgment shall be left in the hands of the Reader. Where, after his examination upon the Vulgate Translator and Cameron,² you read: "I would suppose that these words are thus able more aptly to be translated: *Mouth to mouth I spoke to him*, and not by *Vision nor by dark sayings*; and he contemplated the *Similitude of the Lord*. Wherefore then were ye not afraid to rail against my servant, against Moses?"³ And then, among other things, the Illustrious Man subjoins: "I believe that the word מְרֹאֶה/*vision/appearance* is in the place of בְּמְרֹאֶה, *by vision*, through an ellipsis of the prefixed ב/*in/by*, to be understood here easily from the following בְּחִידוֹת, *by dark sayings*. Indeed, the adverb of negation, לֹא/*not*, set down between וּמְרֹאֶה, *and the Vision*, and בְּחִידוֹת, *by dark sayings*, affects both those words, I believe, both the antecedent and the consequent; in the same manner in which in Psalm 4:4 it is said רָגַזוּ וְאַל-תִּחַמְדוּ, *be ye moved*, that is, *by anger*, and *sin not*, ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε, *be ye angry*, and *sin not*, Ephesians 4:26. The sense is that we ought *neither to be moved by anger*, nor thus *to sin*. Finally, by תְּמִנַּת יְהוָה, *the similitude of the Lord*, I understand this *Most Glorious Symbol* of the presence of *Jehovah*, a

¹ That is, Johann Gottlob Carpzov.

² John Cameron (1580-1625) was a Protestant divine of great distinction, serving as Professor of Philosophy at Sedan, Professor of Divinity at Saumur (1608) and at Glasgow (1620). His modified Calvinism was adopted and followed by Amyraut.

³ Hebrew: פֶּה אֶל-פֶּה אֲדַבֵּר-בּוֹ וּמְרֹאֶה וְלֹא בְּחִידוֹת וְתִמְנַת יְהוָה יֵגִיט וּמִדּוּעַ לֹא יֵרָאֶתָם לְדַבֵּר. בְּעֵבֶר בְּמִשְׁפָּה:

view from the *Back* and *hinder parts* of which God promised to Moses, as *about to happen in the desert of Sinai*, according to that which is narrated in our Text, Exodus 33:23; but, that He *granted* this view of His *Glory* to him, Jehovah testifies in this passage of *Numbers*, when Israel was encamped in *Hazereth*.”

λ. Less certain than the species of Revelation just now mentioned is the mode of Revelation through the *Urim* and *Thummim*, *Lights* and *Perfections*,¹ which are sometimes called very emphatically אֲתֵּרֵי הָאֲוִירִים וְאֲתֵּרֵי הַתְּמִימִים, *the Urim and the Thummim*,² concerning which, in addition to many other illuminating Antiquities of the Hebrews, see the discussion of HEINRICH ALTING, in his *Theologia problematica nova*, locus II, problem VII, pages 94-98; BUDDEUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica Veteris Testamenti*, period II, section I, § 32, tome I, pages 558-563, who also makes mention of various others to be consulted concerning this matter; to which add LAMPE'S *Orationem de Urim et Thummim Dissertationem Theologicam*, volume II, pages 595-651.

Concerning what the Urim and Thummim might be, the twofold opinion of Interpreters is especially probable.

1. For many think that the Urim and Thummim were nothing other than the twelve Gems of the Breastplate of the High Priest, engraved with the names of the children of Israel: α. For otherwise it is never declared what the Urim and Thummim were. β. When the preparation of the garment of the High Priest, and thus also the breastplate, is treated, mention is made of the *stones*, but no mention of the Urim, Exodus 39:8, 10; and when there is discussion concerning the same being put on Aaron, with the stones passed over, the *Urim* and *Thummim* are joined with the breastplate, Leviticus 8:8. γ. The names of the *Urim* and *Thummim* match well with the Gems of the breastplate. The Precious Stones, translucent and scattering extraordinary brilliance in every direction, are able with good reason to be called *Lights*. The same, on account of their rare size, unusual beauty, and enormous value, are able to be called *Perfections*; especially when the hand of a skilled artisan had been added, skillfully cutting, polishing, setting the stones, and ingeniously placing them in their sockets. The Most Illustrious VRIEMOET,³ in his *Thesibus Antiquitatum Israeliticarum* CCCXXXIX, “It

¹ אֲוִירִים/*Urim* appears to be related to אֹר/ *flame* or אֹר/ *light*. תְּמִימִים/ *Thummim* is derived from the verbal root תָּמַם, *to be complete*.

² Exodus 28:30; Leviticus 8:8.

³ Emo Lucius Vriemoet (1699-1760) was a Dutch Reformed Theologian and

appears that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were heaps of the most brilliant stones in addition to the remaining twelve; not something else.” In the same manner he writes in *Thesibus Antiquitatum Israeliticarum*, part I, chapter XII, § 27, “Twelve *Gems*, with the names of the twelve tribes, were grafted onto the surface of the breastplate. With which thus prepared by the hand of Moses, finally were added the *Urim* and *Thummim*. Which, therefore, were not the twelve *Gems* themselves, but perhaps they were some mound of other, most brilliant stones, and that twofold.”

2. Nevertheless, others think that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were not provided by a human hand, but something that was fashioned by God Himself and delivered to Moses, the material of which is no more able to be determined than the kinds of Stones upon which were inscribed the Law; but which Moses was obliged to store within the twofold breastplate behind the twelve *Gems*, hidden from sight: by which God willed to indicate that the prophetic Spirit shall be present with the High Priest, when by the *Urim* and *Thummim* he would consult God, who would *illuminate* his intellect with a knowledge of arcane things, and would *make perfectly manifest* a doubtful event, whence they were assigned the name *Urim* and *Thummim*. Neither are these destitute of arguments for their opinion: for, *α.* after a sufficiently luminous mention was made in Exodus 28, concerning the preparation of the Breastplate and its twelve *Gems*, verse 30, it follows as a specific mandate that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were to be stored in that breastplate. *β.* In Exodus 39, all things are carefully reviewed, even unto minutiae, that were to be prepared by the hand of the artisan concerning the Breastplate and its *Gems*; but there is no mention of the *Urim* and *Thummim* *in that place*; an eminent proof that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were not fashioned by a human artisan. But when Moses clothed Aaron with the Pontifical vestments in Leviticus 8, it is read in verse 8, וַיִּשֶׂם עָלָיו אֶת־הַחֹשֶׁן, *and he put upon him the breastplate*, which, now complete, was adorned, with the twelve *Gems* grafted onto it by Bezaleel. But when all the artisans had together directed their effort in the preparation of the breastplate, yet they lacked the *Urim* and *Thummim*, for which reason it is added concerning Moses, וַיֵּתֵן, *not he was fashioning or providing, but he was adding, merely bestowing* (that is, as he had received the same from the Lord), אֶל־הַחֹשֶׁן אֶת־הָאֲרִיִּם וְאֶת־הַתְּמִיִּם: *to the breastplate the Urim and*

Thummim. And, γ. perhaps for this reason the breastplate had to be twofold, so that in its interior fold the Urim and Thummim might be able to be stored: compare Exodus 28:16; 39:9. I leave the option of either opinion to the Reader; I am unwilling to deny that the latter pleases me very much.

By these the highest Divinity was giving responses to the High Priest now equipped with the Urim, when the King or supreme Prince in difficult circumstances, upon which salvation was actually depending, especially in undertaking war, was coming to consult God through the Priest: see Numbers 27:18, 21; 1 Samuel 23:6, 8-12; 30:7, 8. It is difficult to specify the true *mode* of this lost oracle. The Jews relate that the brightness of those letters, from which the response was composed, was unusual and standing out from the breastplate: hence they allege that, besides the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, inscribed on the Stones of the Breastplate were also the names of אֲבִרָהִם, יִצְחָק, יַעֲקֹב, *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob*, and שְׁבִטַי־יָהּ, *the tribe of Jah*,¹ or שְׁבִטַי יִשׁוּרוּן, *the tribes of Jeshurun*, or כָּל אֵלֶּה שְׁבִטַי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *all these tribes of Israel*; for, of course, otherwise all the letters of the Hebrew Alphabet were not found inscribed on the stones of the breastplate. But that thus a conspicuous patch is rashly sewn onto the Sacred history; and that it was ἀδύνατον/*impossible* enough for the High Priest to learn from letters of this sort, flashing and protruding, responses, everyone sees. Therefore, to the High Priest consulting God by the Urim and Thummim God gave the desired response by a sonorous voice, or He showed it to him by an internal illumination of the mind and revelation of the prophetic Spirit, which was to be given by way of response to the King or Prince. According to the Most Illustrious VRIEMOET, in his *Thesibus Antiquitatum Israeliticarum CCCCXLIX*, “Divine responses appear to have been given through the Urim and Thummim by a voice altogether clear and intelligible.” He asserts the same again, *Thesibus Selectæ Controversæ ex Antiquitatibus Israeliticis*, XCI.

Now, this consultation ordinarily was to be done *before the face of Jehovah*, Numbers 27:21, whether the Priest stand in the Holy Place, turned toward the Holy of Holies and the place of the Shekhinah; or whether the Prince, consulting the mouth of the Lord, and the Priest, through whom he was asking God, stand together in the same place in

¹ Psalm 122:4: “Whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord (שְׁבִטַי־יָהּ), unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord.”

the Courtyard of the Priests.

The *Urim* and *Thummim*, and the divine responses through them, with some other things, are said to have been wanting in the second Temple, to which point Ezra 2:63 is also consulted: see *Concionem meam introductoriam in pago Oostzaandam habitam ad Deuteronomy 33:8 a*, in a volume, which is entitled *Gedactenis, etc*; SAMUEL CHANDLER'S¹ *A Critical History of the Life of David, preface, volume I, pages 10-13*.

Concerning the threefold Word of God, rational, sensible, and prophetic, which we may apprehend through right Reasoning, Sense, and Faith, which things *Hobbes* relates, see the things called into examination in COCQUIUS' *Hobbesianismi Anatome, locus I, chapter I, pages 7-11*.

β. As far as the Means of differentiating the Word divinely revealed from another, which is not such, are concerned:

1. *The Prophets themselves recognized the Divinity of such Revelation, partly by external Signs, partly by internal Light, by which God disclosed Himself to them.* The Most Illustrious WITSIUS, in book I of *Miscellaneorum sacrorum, tome I*, discussing Prophets and Prophecy, in which he inquires into the Marks whereby the Prophets were persuaded of the Divinity, and consequently of the Verity, of Revelation; enumerates, *a.* the Majesty of the revealing God seen by the Prophets, *b.* the manifest Light of that Revelation recognized, by which they were distinguishing the voice of God from every human voice, no less than one easily distinguishes the voice of a parent, of a son, of a brother. *c.* The wisdom, holiness, sublimity, and θεοπρέπειαν / *divine-majesty*; if this did not always immediately approve itself to conscience, in such revelations the conviction of Divinity is not so much from a consideration of the thing revealed, as from the clarity of the revelation and the majesty of the One revealing, and from a hidden force eliciting the firmest assent: see *Miscellaneorum sacrorum, tome I, book I, chapter XV, § 1-18*. Consult CARPZOV'S² *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti, chapter I, § 14, pages 38, 39, § 27, pages 82, 83*.

2. *Both the Argument of the Doctrine revealed, says our AUTHOR, and the Signs added, and also the character of the Prophets procure confidence for the revelation in the Church.* WITSIUS, in his *Miscellaneorum sacrorum, tome I, book I, chapter XV, § 19-46*, coming to add Marks by

¹ Samuel Chandler (1693-1766) was a Presbyterian, Nonconformist minister and scholar. His theology shows signs of the intrusion of Rationalism.

² That is, Johann Gottlob Carpzov.

which the Prophets persuaded others that they were sent by God for the disclosure of that Revelation, which they were advancing, mentions, *a.* the steadfast testimony of the Prophet himself concerning his mission to the people from God, *b.* the honest, holy life of the Prophet,¹ and in which an exemplar of all virtues was gleaming with a most splendid light. *c.* To which is sometimes added the complement of prior prophecies; *d.* sometimes God also was sealing the mission of the Prophet by Miracles;² unto the external appearance of which, however, the attention was not to be given, when doctrines plainly false were set forth.³ *e.* Sometimes God granted authority to θεοπνεύστοις/*inspired* Men by manifest vengeance against the disobedient. But how those Prophets approved their mission, for whose sake no wonder had been hitherto wrought, WITSIUS especially inquires, *Miscellaneorum sacrorum, tome I, book I, chapter XV, § 40:* consult CARPZOV'S *Introductionem ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti, chapter I, § 20, 21, pages 52-58:* consult COCQUIUS' *Hobbesianismi Anatomen, locus XVI, chapter XXXIII, section 2, pages 585, 586;* LELAND'S *Beschouwing van de Schriften der Deisten, tome 1, chapter 12, pages 370, 371.*

Finally, our AUTHOR observes that *all this mode of Revelation has now ordinarily ceased, and so we have the Scripture as the One divinely Revealed Word.* WITSIUS deserves to be consulted on this point, *Miscellaneorum sacrorum, tome I, book I, chapter XXIV,* where he discusses the Continuation of Prophecy after the departure of the Apostles, and, with those things enumerated which make for the confirmation of this thesis, he judges: 1. That it does not appear to be a thing altogether to be denied, that the gift of Prophecy was lively and active unto the third or fourth Century, although not all things that are related by the Fathers are to be indiscriminately admitted. 2. That in the Sacred Scripture no declaration of the divine will is found, by which it might be established that the prophetic gift is to continue perpetually in the Church; while, in Joel 2:28, 29, with the prophetic expressions taken from the economy of the Old Testament, but to be explained consistently with the New economy, is promised an abundance of light, of the knowledge of God, and of progress in it; which things were going to be such that rank and file believers of the New Testament, compared with the rank and file believers of the Old Testament, were going to surpass them by so great

¹ 2 Peter 1:21.

² For example, Mark 16:20; Hebrews 2:4.

³ Deuteronomy 13:1-3; Matthew 24:24; 2 Thessalonians 2:9.

an interval as was formerly between the Prophets and other men the common people. At the same time, God wished to set on record a certain extraordinary argument and deposit, as it were, of that, in that extraordinary and altogether miraculous effusion of the Spirit upon the Apostles, of which effusion in those first times He made certain others to be sharers, and in which the very words of the prophecy are fulfilled according to their very sound. 3. That the Church, after the completion of the Canon of Scripture, does not need new Revelations, whether to add new dogmas to those delivered in it, or to illustrate the dark passages of the Scriptures, which God did not even promise for the understanding of the Apocalypse, Revelation 1:3. 4. That those that profess new Revelations generally furnish nothing that is not able to proceed from common industry: indeed, in those pretended Revelations they are wont more to show the genius of the writer than the character of the divine Spirit; which he shows by the example of the procedure of Thaumaturgus,¹ and of the Revelations of Christina Paniatovia, and also of Christopher Kotterus.² 5. That it is dangerous to labor after a reputation of Revelation, lofty and surpassing the common calling; seeing that the prophecies of Müntzer resulted in the destruction of himself and many others:³ and although the confidence and grandiloquence of Nicolaus Drabicius was incredible, yet his prophecy concerning the end of the kingdom of the Beast and of idolatry in the year 1650; concerning the coronation of Ragotski, Prince of Transylvania, at the extirpation of the house of Austria; concerning the wailings and lamentations which would come to the house of Austria on March 19, 1652, with the tenth horn falling from the head of the beast;

¹ Gregory Thaumaturgus, or the *Wonder-worker* (c. 213-c. 270) was a disciple of Origin, and later Bishop of Cæsarea. His pastoral labors did much to advance the Christian faith in Asia Minor. It is said of him that he wrought miracles, and received revelatory visits from the Apostle John and Mary.

² John Amos Comenius (1592-1670) was a Moravian educator and author. Comenius was a mystic, and in his *Lux in tenebris* he published the prophecies and visions of Krystyna Poniatowska (a Moravian mystic, who began prophesying in 1627) and Christopher Kotterus (of Silesia, who began prophesying in 1616).

³ Thomas Münster (c. 1489-1525) was a German theologian and mystic. Seeking a more radical Reformation, he broke with Luther and became a rebel leader in the Peasants' War. Putting confidence in ongoing revelation, he led a group of about eight thousand peasant against a superior force at Frankenhausen (1525). The peasants were slaughtered; and Münster was captured, tortured, and decapitated.

and concerning no further Roman Emperor from the house of Austria:¹ these and similar prophecies of Drabicius, I say, passed into smoke, neither did the event answer to these. Hence WITSIUS leaves all the more recent prophecies in their place, to be approved or refuted by the event; and by no such prophecy does he suffer himself to be impelled to either fear or hope anything vehemently; still less that he, overstepping the bounds of his calling, might apply his hand to such a dangerous work. 6. Yet he does not think that it is to be denied that it frequently happens that men, pious and admitted unto a nearer and closer friendship with the Divine, are by Him taught concerning future things; the knowledge of which is extremely useful for the stirring of piety, for the consolation of the soul, for strengthening in faith and hope and exercising prudence. Yet, on the other hand, he does not think that all things related are rashly to be received. But if any Revelations might fall to any, the purpose of the Revelations is more for their private information, than that they might be to others, still less to the Church, for a norm of faith and actions: seeing that they themselves perhaps are able to discern by the internal light of the Spirit that these things come to them from heaven; but they are destitute of arguments by which they might prove to the conscience of others the Divinity of the Revelation made to them.

And according to these shall be also the judgment concerning the Groningen Revelations spread some year earlier, which that similar Biblical Soothsaying renders suspect above the others, bringing old wives' superstition, not to be excused of a sinful temptation of God; concerning which the altogether prudent Judgment of the Theological Faculty of Groningen deserves to be consulted, committed to writing by the Most Illustrious À VELZEN and GERDES:² see also in this work below, *Chapter XII*, § 19.

¹ Nicholas Drabicius (1588-1671), son of a burgomaster in Moravia, was admitted to the ministry, but was forced into exile by the severe edicts of the Emperor against Protestantism. He was more than fifty years old when the visions began. He prophesied that the house of Austria would be crushed, that Prince Ragotski would command one of the victorious armies, and that Drabicius himself and his brethren would be restored to their native land. However, Ragotski died, without accomplishing the defeat of the house of Austria; indeed, the house of Austria waxed in strength, rivaling its former power. Comenius published Drabicius' prophecies in *Lux in Tenebris*.

² Daniel Gerdes (1698-1765) was a German Reformed Theologian. He served as Professor of Theology at Duisburg (1726-1735), and at Groningen (1736-1765).

§ 34: The Object of Revealed Theology: True Religion

After the Principium, in order to establish the specific Difference of Theological Doctrine, the *Object* concurs, which is known, 1. from the *name* of the discipline, which is *Theology*; and, 2. from the *argument of Sacred Scripture*, which is the sole Principium of Revealed Theology. *Theology*, of course, means *the Doctrine concerning God*, and consequently relates the *Knowledge and Worship of God*. Hence, either *true Religion*, to be learned from Revelation; or *God*, as He has revealed Himself in Scripture, and as He has made Himself ours through the grace of Christ, constitutes the *Object* of the Theological discipline, even the *Formal Object*. Of course, the *Material Object* denotes the matter concerning which the one speaking speaks in general; the *Formal Object* also includes the mode, or special regard, under which the one speaking dwells upon it: for example, *Man* is the material object of painting, of physical science, ethics, medicine, but considered under one and another formal reckonings: he is the formal object of the painting art as paintable; of physical science as he has a species of body to be referred to the genus of physical bodies; man is the object of ethics as capable of virtue and felicity; of medicine as sick and curable. Thus *God* is the material object of Pneumatics, of Theology natural and revealed: but *God* is the *formal* object of Pneumatics and natural Theology as He is to be known and worshipped from nature and according to the dictate of reason: *God* is the *formal object* of revealed Theology as He is to be known and worshipped from the precept of Revelation; not to be known categorically under the reckoning of *Deity*, as Thomas and a great many Scholastics maintain, which knowledge is of itself not saving, but rather condemning to sinners: but as *God* is made *ours*, and that as He is covenanted in Christ, just as He reveals Himself to us in the Word.

And, as *God* is thus the *primary* Object of Theology, so also the *Works of God*, and among those *Man* himself, *as the greatest work of God*, and *the End and Object of His greatest works*, are able to be held as the *Secondary* Object of Theology, that is, as far as the Sacred Scripture also treats of all these, and all the same have a relation to *God*, whether of origin, or of conservation and dependence; and they were made by *God*, subsist through Him, are subordinate to Him, and ought to tend toward Him. If

you ask concerning *Sin*, the treatment of which also enters into Theology, in what manner it might be able to be referred unto God and Divine Things? I respond that, not as it is of God, but as it has a certain *σχέσιν*/*relation* to God, and lies under His Providence and Justice; just as Medicine treats of diseases and poisons, although its principal object is the healing of man.

§ 35: The Subject of Revealed Theology: Fallen Man

A further Difference of Definition is taken from the *Subject*. That is, Revealed Theology has been designed for the education of *Man*, whom we just now considered as the *Secondary* Object of Theology as well. When we contemplate Man as *Fallen*, to whom this doctrine, like a plank after a shipwreck, was given, that he might rise again from his fall, Psalm 19:7; 2 Timothy 3:17, while the natural Theology of man in his Integrity was previously treated in § 16, which will recur in Chapter XIV: but, even if Revelation also came to man in his integrity, yet all his Theology was *Legal*; on the other hand, the Revealed Theology of Fallen man also deserves to be called *Evangelical* and *Christian* under the New Testament.

§ 36: The Ends of Revealed Theology

Finally, in the Difference of the Definition is mentioned its *End*; the *supreme End* of Revealed Theology is the *Glory of God*; which He set before Himself in all His works, Proverbs 16:4, but especially in Redemption, 1 Peter 2:9, and its doctrine, Ephesians 3:10, even as Redemption and its doctrine show forth most perfectly the *Glory of God*, through a demonstration of His highest attributes.

The subordinate End is the *Salvation of the Elect*, John 20:31; Titus 1:2. Because, of course, in the Salvation of the Elect the Attributes of God shall be most gloriously manifested, and shall be most perfectly acknowledged and celebrated forever by Those Saved, 2 Thessalonians 1:10; hence the Salvation of the Elect shall be as advantageous as possible to the Glory of God as the supreme End; and hence the whole work of Redemption has subordinate End, the leading of the Elect unto Salvation.

That here and frequently in what follows the *Glory of God* is considered rightly in the Definitions as the *Supreme End*, to which the *Salvation of the Elect* is subordinated, you will see confirmed in *de Nederlandse Bibliotheek*, volume 2, n. 4, pages 230-234.

Index

- Acronius, Joannes, 207
Agathias Scholasticus, 182
Ainsworth, Henry, 91
Albert the Great, 184-185
Albigensians, 185
Allatius, Leo, 209
Alsted, Johann Heinrich, 177
Alting, Heinrich, 55
Ambrose, 29
Ames, William, 71
Amphilochius, 27
Amyraut, Moïse, 131
Antigonus II Gonats, 154
Apollinaris, 196
Aquinas, Thomas, 43-44
Archimedes, 104
Arethas, 29
Arius, 63
Aristides, 154
Arnobius, 28
Arnoldi, Nicolaus, 55, 134
Athanasius, 26
Athenagoras, 80
Austro-Sylvius, Petrus Jakobus, 75
Aventinus, Johannes, 184
Baronio, Cesare, 146, 209
Basil the Great, 26
Becmann, Christian, 118
Bekker, Balthasar, 212
Bellarmine, Robert, 198
Benoit, Rene, 198
Bernard of Clairvaux, 29
Beza, Theodore, 65
Blount, Charles, 150
Bogerman, Johannes, 207
Bohme, Jacob, 74
Bolingbroke, Henry St. John of, 170
Bonaventure, 185
Bonnet, Gijsbert, 109
Bossuet, Jacques-Bénigne, 196
Bourignon, Antoinette, 74
Braun, Johannes, 87
Buddeus, Johann Franz, 23
Bull, George, 58
Burman, Frans, 125
Cabeljauw, Pieter, 72
Cajetan, Thomas, 186
Calovius, Abraham, 73
Cameron, John, 232
Camillus, Marcus Furius, 154
Carpzov, Johann Benedict II, 79
Carpzov, Johann Gottlob, 63
Casaubon, Isaac, 146
Cato (the Younger), 167
Cerinthus, 50
Chamier, Daniel, 71
Chandler, Samuel, 236
Charondas, 169
Chauvin, Pierre, 134
Chrysostom, John, 26
Cleanthes, 143-144
Clement of Alexandria, 25
Cloppenburg, Johann, 73
Cocceius, Johannes, 44
Cocquius, Gisbertus, 43
Collins, Anthony, 151
Comenius, John Amos, 238
Corvinus, Johannes Arnoldi, 165
Craanen, Theodor, 162
Crellius, Johannes, 118
Crocus, Johannes, 74
Cudworth, Ralph, 143
Curcellæus, Etienne, 149
Cyprian, 28
Cyril of Alexandria, 27
Cyril of Jerusalem, 26
Danæus, Lambert, 70
Deyling, Salomon, 63
Dilherr, Johannes Michael, 206
Dinant, Petrus, 171
Dionysius of Alexandria, 46
Dionysius (Pseudo-), 26
Dippel, John Conrad, 74

- Dooregeest, Engel Arendszoon
 van, 213
 Doreslaer, Abraham à, 81-82
 Drabicius, Nicholas, 239
 Draco, 169
 Drusius, Joannes, 207
 Du Cange, Charles de Fresne, 183
 Duperron, Jacques Davy, 198
 Durandus, 152
 Ebionites, 50
 Eckhard, Heinrich, 155
 Epicureans, 103
 Epiphanius, 26
 Episcopus, Simon, 133
 Essenius, Andreas, 21
 Estienne, Henri, 53
 Estius, William, 68
 Eusebius, 26
 Evagrius Scholasticus, 182
 Fabricius, Franciscus, 217
 Fabritius, Johann Ludwig, 138
 Firmicus (Julius Firmicus
 Maternaus), 80
 Franz, Wolfgang, 216
 Friedlieb, Philipp Heinrich, 177
 Frobenius, Hieronymous, 48
 Fruytier, Jacobus, 225
 Gaussen, Etienne, 215
 Gerdes, Daniel, 239
 Gerhard, John, 179
 Glassius, Solomon, 42
 Gomar, Franciscus, 9, 62
 Gousset, Jacques, 78
 Gravesande, Willem Jacob 's, 229
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 26
 Gregory of Nyssa, 27
 Gregory the Great, 29
 Grevinckhoven, Nicolaas, 75
 Grotius, Hugo, 77
 Gwalther, Rudolf, 155
 Hackspan, Theodoricus, 62
 Heidanus, Abraham, 122
 Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, 161
 Heraclitus of Ephesus, 148
 Herbert, Edward, 150
 Hesiod, 45
 Heumann, Christoph August, 47
 Hilary, 29
 Hippolytus, 25
 Hobbes, Thomas, 43
 Hofstede, Petrus, 155
 Honert, Jan van den, 75-76
 Honert, Taco Hajo van den, 217
 Hoorbeeck, Johannes, 9
 Huber, Marie, 84
 Huber, Ulrich, 2225
 Huet, Pierre-Daniel, 122
 Hulsius, Antonius, 78
 Hulsius, Paulus, 64
 Ignatius, 25
 Irenæus, 25
 Irhoven, Willem van, 128
 John of Damascus, 27
 Junius, Franciscus, 9
 Justin Martyr, 25
 Juvenius, Gaius Vettius
 Aquilinus, 51
 König, Georg Matthias, 184
 Labadie, Jean de, 129
 Lactantius, 28
 Lampe, Frederic Adolphus, 47
 Lapide, Cornelius à , 158
 Launoy, Jean de, 183
 Le Clerc, Jean, 58
 Leeuwen, Gerbrand van, 220
 Leland, John, 83
 Lent, Johann à, 79
 Leydekker, Melchior, 47
 Limborch, Philip van, 88
 Locke, John, 114
 Lombard, Peter, 182
 Lucretius, 103
 Lulofs, Johannes, 103
 Lubbertus, Sibrandus, 207
 Lycurgus, 169
 Machiavelli, Niccolò di Bernardo
 dei, 104
 Majus, Johann Heinrich, 78
 Manichæism, 77, 185
 Marckius, Johannes, 10
 Maresius, Samuel, 73
 Marti, Ramón, 79
 Martinus, Matthias, 183
 Maastricht, Petrus van, 21

- Maximus Monachus, 196
 Mestrezat, Jean, 157
 Meurs, Johannes van, 183
 Meyer Lodewijk, 218
 Minos, 169
 Minucius Felix, 28
 Monophysites, 196
 Mosheim, Johann Lorenz von, 213
 Moulin, Pierre du, 75
 Münster, Thomas, 238
 Nestorius, 77
 Nieuwentyt, Bernard, 106
 Numa Pompilius, 154, 169
 Œcumenius, 27-28
 Olearius, Joannes Gottfridus, 184
 Optatus, 29
 Origen, 25
 Ostorodt, Krzysztof, 133
 Oudin, Remi-Casimir, 52
 Owen, John, 46
 Pamelius, Jacobus, 179
 Pasor, Georgius, 43
 Pelagius, 70
 Petronius, 103
 Pfaff, Christoph Matthæus, 153
 Pfanner, Tobias, 161
 Philastrius, 29
 Philo of Alexandria, 58
 Photius, 27
 Pictet, Benedict, 71
 Pitiscus, Samuel, 183
 Poiret, Pierre, 74
 Pneumatomachi, 196
 Prudentius, 29
 Pythagoras, 46
 Raey, Johannes de, 220
 Reimar, Hermann Samuel, 101
 Reland, Adriaan, 78
 Rittangel, Johann Stephan, 63
 Rivet, Andrew, 71
 Roëll, Hermann Alexaner, 57, 126
 Ruffinus, 179
 Sanchuniathon, 45
 Scaliger, Julius Cæsar, 41
 Schlichting, Jonas, 54-55
 Scotus, John Duns, 186
 Sedulius, Cælius, 51
 Seneca, Lucius Annæus, 102
 Severian, 49
 Sfondrati, Celestino, 152
 Smalcus, Valentinus, 216
 Smout, Adriaen Jorisz, 76
 Socinus, Faustus, 54
 Socrates of Constantinople, 195
 Solon, 169
 Soto, Dominic, 152
 Sozzini, Lelio, 72-73
 Spanheim, Frederic (the Elder), 71
 Spanheim, Frederic (the Younger),
 22
 Spinoza, Baruch, 126
 Stapfer, John Frederick, 70
 Steno, Nicolas, 220
 Suetonius, 114
 Suicer, John Casper, 48
 Tatian, 80
 Tertullian, 28
 Testard, Paul, 153
 Thaumaturgus, Gregory, 238
 Theodoret, 27
 Theophilus of Antioch, 64
 Theophylact, 49
 Theseus, 154
 Thomasius, Jakob, 184
 Thomas of Strasburg, 190
 Thucydides, 41
 Tilenus, Daniel, 153
 Tindal, Matthew, 151
 Tirinus, James, 158
 Tostatus, Alonso, 152
 Trent (Council of), 72
 Trigland, Jacobus (the Elder), 75
 Trigland, Jacobus (the Younger),
 105
 Turretin, Francis, 57
 Utenbogardus, Johannes, 178
 Van Aalst, Gerardus, 85
 Van de Wynpersse, Dionysius,
 104
 Varro, Marcus Terentius, 82
 Vatablus, Francis, 68
 Vega, Andreas de, 152
 Velzen, Cornelius van, 134
 Venator, Adolf, 153

- Véron, François, 198
Vitringa, Campegius (Jr.), 126
Vitringa, Campegius (Sr.), 42
Vlaming, Philippe, 153
Voetius, Gisbertus, 78
Vogelsand, Reinerus, 87
Voidovius, Andrew, 216
Voisin, Joseph de, 79
Volkel, Johanns, 73
Vorstius, Conradus, 134
Vossius, Gerhard Johann, 80
Vriemoet, Emo Lucius, 233-234
Vries, Gerardus de, 23
Waeyen, Johannes van der, 63
Walæus, Antonius, 9
Waldenses, 72
Walenburgii, 198
Walloons, 129
Weigel, Valentin, 80
Weismann, Christian Eberhard, 74
Wendelin, Marcus Friedrich, 155
Wesselius, Johannes, 9
Witsius, Hermann, 9
Wittich, Christoph, 163
Wolzogen, Johann Ludwig von,
55, 129
Zalmoxis, 169
Zeno, 143