

A Translation with Introduction to
A SUMMARY OF ELENCTIC THEOLOGY
BY LEONARD RIJSSEN

by

J. Wesley White

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
GREENVILLE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Theology

April 2009

Faculty Advisor:

C. N. Willborn, PhD

Second Faculty Reader:

P. John Carrick, DMin

Academic Dean:

Benjamin Shaw, PhD

Table of Contents

Introduction	<u>iii</u>
Chapter 1 – Theology	<u>1</u>
Chapter 2 – Holy Scripture	<u>8</u>
Chapter 3 – God	<u>28</u>
Chapter 4 – The Trinity	<u>45</u>
Chapter 5 – God’s Decree	<u>52</u>
Chapter 6 – Predestination	<u>58</u>
Chapter 7 – Creation	<u>66</u>
Chapter 8 – God’s Providence	<u>77</u>
Chapter 9 – The Law, the Fall, and Sin	<u>82</u>
Chapter 10 – The Covenant of Grace	<u>100</u>
Chapter 11 – Christ	<u>111</u>
Chapter 12 – Christ’s Offices	<u>127</u>
Chapter 13 – Conversion and Faith	<u>144</u>
Chapter 14 – Justification	<u>159</u>
Chapter 15 – The Decalogue and Good Works	<u>170</u>
Chapter 16 – The Church	<u>197</u>
Chapter 17 – The Sacraments	<u>222</u>
Chapter 18 – Last Things	<u>242</u>
Bibliography	<u>254</u>

Introduction

Leonard Rijssen (1636?-1700?)¹ was a prominent Reformed Pastor and theologian who was active in the controversies of the seventeenth century theological scene in the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands. He also labored to provide summaries of theological positions for the use of Pastors and students. In Rijssen's work *A Complete Summary of Elenctic Theology and of as much Didactic Theology as is necessary* (hereafter *SET*),² we have an example of the type of work he did and a window into the seventeenth century Reformed world. In this introductory essay we wish to provide some of the background that Rijssen would have assumed in all those who read this work in the seventeenth century. The three words of the title provide the three major themes for this background study. Its *theology* is that of reformed orthodoxy. Its *summary* character provides an example of scholasticism. Its *elenctic* approach indicates the challenges and difficulties that Reformed theologians faced in the seventeenth century in defending their positions against many powerful opponents. After this discussion, we will look briefly at Rijssen's life and works and then draw some conclusions from the *SET* and suggest its usefulness for our own day.

¹ Also known as Rijssenius, Van Rijssen, Van Ryssen, Ryssen, Ryssenius, Van Riissen, Riissen, or Riissenius. In Dutch works, he is most commonly found in the index under Ryssen or Ryssenius.

² Leonardus Rijssenius, *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* (Edinburgh: George Morman, 1992).

Part 1 - Its *Theology* – Reformed Orthodoxy

The History of Reformed Orthodoxy

Though Rijssen does not use the word “orthodox” in the *SET*, he is clearly defending a body of Reformed orthodoxy.³ Orthodoxy comes from Greek and means “right teaching.” The Reformed Church held to a specific doctrinal content that defined their Church and teaching over against Rome, Lutheranism, and the Radical Reformation. It is important to understand that when we refer to orthodoxy we are referring to doctrinal *content* and *not* to a method of doing theology.⁴

The development of the Reformed branch of the Protestant Church begins with Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531) and his differences with Martin Luther.⁵ Zwingli labored in Zürich, and for this reason Switzerland became the center of the Reformed Churches. This became especially true under the work of Zwingli’s successor, Henry Bullinger, and the Reformed theologian of Geneva, John Calvin. From Switzerland, the Reformed Church spread to France, Scotland, England, the Netherlands, Germany, and elsewhere.

³ This is a word that was used by the Reformed theologians of the age. Turretin makes use of it in his *Institutio* and the word is found in Rijssen’s summary of Turretin’s work, on which see below, pp. l-llii.

⁴ See the same point in W.J. van Asselt, P.L. Rouwendal, et al., *Inleiding in de Gereformeerde Scholastiek* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998), 13-14 and Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, Vol. 1: Prolegomena to Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003), 33-4.

⁵ See below on the Lutherans, pp. xxxvi-xxxviii.

The era of Reformed orthodoxy extends roughly from 1560-1790.⁶ It may be divided into the three eras of early (1560-1620), high (1620-1700), and late orthodoxy (1700-1790). The 1560s were very significant for the Reformed. First, the Council of Trent was completed in 1563, which indicated Rome's definitive rejection of the Reformation. Second, most of the Reformed Churches adopted confessions articulating their doctrinal positions in that decade: France (1559), Scotland (1560), the Netherlands (1561), Germany (1563), and Switzerland (1566). In the context of this orthodox consensus, many theologians labored to consolidate the gains of the Reformation and adapt them to the institutional contexts of national Churches and universities as well as making use of the Catholic tradition (the Medieval theologians and the Church Fathers) in a way that was adapted to the central concerns of the Reformation. We can see this work in men like Bartholmeus Keckermann (1571-1609),⁷ Johann Henrich Alsted (1588-1638),⁸

⁶ See also Muller's discussion in *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:30-32. I am following the timeline set forth by Asselt and Rouwnedal in *Inleiding* in part for reason of simplicity. Their discussion of each of these time periods also provides a very helpful summary (see 91-162).

⁷ Joseph S. Freedman, "The Career and Writings of Batholomew Keckermann" in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 141 (1997):305-364.

⁸ Howard Hotson, *Johann Heinrich Alsted, 1588-1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation, and Universal Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

Lambert Daneau (1530-1595),⁹ William Perkins (1558-1602),¹⁰ William Ames (1576-1633),¹¹ and Franciscus Junius (1545-1602).¹²

To give an idea of the work of these men, we will consider briefly the work of Franciscus Junius, a leader of the Dutch Reformation. He became a Pastor of a Walloon congregation in 1565, but he fled in 1567 because of the Spanish persecution. In 1573 he went to Heidelberg to work on a translation of the Old Testament. In 1582, he went to Neustadt to serve as a professor and then back to Heidelberg in 1584. He finally returned to Holland in 1592 to serve as a professor at the University of Leyden where he died in 1602. His writings are typical of the work that these men did. He wrote *Sacrorum parallelorum libri III* (1585), a discussion of the New Testament's use of the Old; a Hebrew grammar (1580); commentaries on many of the books of the Old

⁹ On Lambert Daneau, see the excellent book by Olivier Fatio, *Methode et Théologie. Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scholastique réformée* (Geneva: Droz, 1976), and *Ibid. Nihil Pulchrius Ordine: Contribution de l'Établissement de la Discipline Écclesiastique aux Pays-Bas ou Lambert Daneau aux Pays-Bas* (Leiden: Brill, 1971). There is also an older work that focuses more on bibliography, Paul de Félice, *Lambert Daneau de Baugency-sur-Loire: Pasteur et professeur en théologie (1530-1594)* (Paris: G. Fischbacher, 1882).

¹⁰ Donald McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins' Theology* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987).

¹¹ Keith L. Sprunger, *The Learned Doctor William Ames* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1972).

¹² D. Franciscus Junius, *Opuscula Theologica Selecta*, ed. Abraham Kuyper (Amsterdam: Frederic Muller and Joannes Hermann Kruyt, 1882). Kuyper also has a preface with a description of his life. See also J. Reitsma, *Franciscus Junius* (Groningen: J. B. Huber, 1864).

Testament; *Animadversiones* (1600), a book against Robert Bellarmine;¹³ *Ecclesastici, sive de natura et administrationibus Ecclesiae Dei, libri III* (1581, 1596), an influential book on Church government; a new translation of the Old Testament into Latin (published in many editions beginning in 1575) with Emanuel Tremellius (1510-1580); as well as various philological and historical works.¹⁴ From this small sample of Junius' works, we can see how these men attempted to take all of the intellectual elements of the Christian tradition from Church organization to translation of the Bible to comments on the Bible and recast them in light of the work of the Reformation.¹⁵

The second major era of Reformed orthodoxy is the era of high orthodoxy from 1620-1700. The beginning of this era is marked by the completion of the Synod of Dort which brought about a clearer definition of Reformed orthodoxy. As J.I. Good remarks, "The canons of Dort had very much the same effect on the Reformed Church that the Formula of Concord had on the Lutheran Church. They crystallized its theology and brought out most clearly its definitions and logical relations."¹⁶ It is toward the end of this period that Rijssen wrote his *SET*, and it is

¹³ On Robert Bellarmine, see below on the section on Rome, xxx-xxxv.

¹⁴ See Kuyper's list in Junius, *Opuscula*, pp. xii-xvi.

¹⁵ See Fatio, *Methode et Théologie*.

¹⁶ James I. Good, *The Origin of the Reformed Churches in Germany (1520-1620)* (Electronic Version: The Synod of the Reformed Churches of the United States, 2004), 364.

illustrative of this period. As Richard Muller notes, “In the high orthodox period, beginning in the 1640s with thinkers like Cloppenburg, Hoornbeeck, and Wendelin, the polemical or controversial element begins to pervade all the loci.”¹⁷ He notes that these writers expanded on the propositions of the earlier theologians by adding controversies and extended discussions of these doctrines. Rijssen provides an excellent example of this, as Muller also notes: “This appears quite clearly in Rijssen’s *Summa theologiae*, wherein doctrine is stated in neatly numbered propositions between which the related controversies are argued and resolved.”¹⁸ This came about not because the Reformed were particularly fond of fighting but more because of the intense struggle that had to be waged against determined and able opponents of Reformed doctrine in the Socinian, Remonstrant, Lutheran, and Romanist camps, as we shall see below.

This era no less than the first produced a great number of gifted theologians who labored to continue the work of the early Reformation and defend it against the high-powered attacks of its opponents. The notable theologians of this era include Francis Turretini (1623-1687),¹⁹

¹⁷ Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:75.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ See J. Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin’s Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace* (Calvin Seminary: Unpublished Dissertation, May 2005). For biographies see Eugene de Budé, *Vie de François Turretini, théologien Genevois* (1623-1687) (Lausanne: George Bridel, 1871) and Gerrit Kizer, *François Turretini: Sa Vie et Ses Œuvres et Le Consensus* (Kampen: J.A. Bos Boekhandel, 1900).

John Owen (1616-1683),²⁰ Richard Baxter (1615-1691),²¹ Samuel Rutherford (1600-1661),²² Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658),²³ Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617-1666),²⁴ Gisbertus Voetius (1580-1676),²⁵ Samuel Maresius (1599-1673),²⁶ and Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669).²⁷ All of these men were prolific writers and made significant contributions to the history of theology.

As one example of these theologians, we shall consider perhaps the greatest of the seventeenth century theologians, Gisbertus Voetius. Voetius is particularly significant for our purposes because Rijssen

²⁰ Peter Toon, *God's Statesman: The Life and Work of John Owen, Pastor, Educator, Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1971).

²¹ Hans Boersma, *A Hot Peppercorn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its 17th Century Context* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993).

²² John Coffey, *Politics, Religion, and British Revolutions: the mind of Samuel Rutherford* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997). See also James Walker, *The Theology and Theologians of Scotland* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1872), 7-12.

²³ Lucien Rimbault, *Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658): un pasteur classique a l'age classique* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1966).

²⁴ J. W. Hofmeyr, *Johannes Hoornbeeck as polemikus* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1975). Note that this book is in Afrikaans. C. Oorsterom, "Johannes Hoornbeeck als Zendingstheoloog" in *Theologia Reformata* 13 (1970):80-98.

²⁵ The largest biography is Arnold Cornelius Duker, *Gisbertus Voetius*, 3 vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1897-1914). A much shorter work is C. Steenblok, *Gisbertus Voetius: Zijn leven en werken* (Gouda: Gereformeerde, 1976). On various aspects of his life and times, see J. Van Oort et al., *De Onbekende Voetius: Voordrachten Wetenschappelijk Symposium, Utrecht 3 maart 1989* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1989). For a discussion of his major work, *Dipsutationes Selectae*, see Willem J. Van Asselt and Eef Dekker, eds., *De Scholastieke Voetius: Een Luisteroefening aan de hand van Voetius' 'Disputationes Selectae'* (Zoetermeer: Bookencentrum, 1995).

²⁶ D. Nauta, *Samuel Maresius* (Amsterdam, H.J. Paris, 1935).

²⁷ Willem J. Van Asselt, *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

studied under him and was heavily influenced by him. Voetius lived a long life that began in 1589 in Heusden, 25 miles south of Utrecht. He studied at Leiden, became a Pastor, was one of the youngest delegates to the Synod of Dort, and did not become a professor until 1634 when he was called to the newly formed University at Utrecht.²⁸ He remained there until his death in 1676. From thence, he exerted a wide influence over the Churches in the Netherlands and beyond.²⁹ His extensive writings include *Ta Asketika*, published in 1664, a comprehensive book on spirituality intended for his students.³⁰ He published *Exercitia et Bibliotheca Studiosi Theologiae* (1651) which contains a virtually endless list of books that students may read and study to gain theological knowledge.³¹ He wrote a four volume work on church government entitled *Politica Ecclesiastica* in which he discusses everything from church discipline to church music.³² Every Saturday, he held disputations or discussions for his students. He collected his writings on

²⁸ Jan Anthony Cramer, *De theologische faculteit de Utrecht ten tijde van Voetius* (Utrecht: Kemnik, 1932).

²⁹ See below on the Voetians in the section on the situation in the Netherlands, pp. xix-xxii.

³⁰ This work has recently been republished with a parallel translation into Dutch and a summary in English by C.A. De Niet, *De Praktijk der Godzaligheid* (Utrecht: De Banier, 1995).

³¹ See Muller's discussion of this book in *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 110-116.

³² Some of this work has been printed in the modern era in F.L. Rutgers and Ph. J. Hoedemaeker, eds., *Tractatus Selecti de Politica Ecclesiastica*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: J.H. Kruyt, 1885-6).

these disputations in five large volumes in which he addresses a great number of theological and practical topics.³³ In addition, he published numerous practical works and sermons. Furthermore, when we examine his writings, we find a mastery of not only the Bible but also cognate Biblical languages and versions, Jewish writers, classical authors, the Church Fathers, theologians from the Middle Ages, and his contemporaries. This is the sort of work that was done in this era, and we must understand that it lies behind the summarizing work that Rijssen was doing in the *SET*.³⁴

Finally, the era of high orthodoxy gave way to the era of late orthodoxy (1700-1790). In late orthodoxy, the Enlightenment began to force its way into Reformed theology, but many attempted to maintain the older orthodoxy. In this era, we see much less vitality and much more of a holding on to what remained of orthodoxy. Perhaps the best place to see the movement to an “enlightened” Christianity is in Switzerland. Jean-Alphonse Turretini (1655-1724), the son of Francis,³⁵

³³ Gisbertus Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae* I-V (Utrecht: Johannes Wansberg, 1648-1669). Abraham Kuypers edited a selection of the disputations in *D. Gisberti Voetii Selectarum Disputationum Fasciculus* (Amsterdam: J.A. Wormser, 1887). The first four volumes are also available at Gallica, the online library of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (<http://gallica.bnf.fr>). These first four volumes amount to over 5,000 pages of theological discussion.

³⁴ That is, Rijssen clearly made use of these sorts of works. He is even listed as a respondent in Voetius' *Disputationes*.

³⁵ See Eugene de Budé, *J.A. Turretini, théologien genevois (1671-1737)* (Lausanne: Georges Bridel, 1880). For a more recent treatment, see Martin I. Klauber, *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671-1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1994).

Jean Osterwald (1663-1747); and Samuel Werenfels (1657-1740) were the three leading theologians. In 1706, they made the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, which had been adopted in 1675, no longer binding. In 1725, they did the same thing with *Canons of Dort* and the *Second Helvetic Confession*.³⁶ Nevertheless, in other quarters, the old orthodoxy was upheld. In the Netherlands, men such as Antonius Driessen (1682-1748) and Alexander Comrie (1706-1774) contended for orthodoxy.³⁷ In other countries as well, men such as Daniel Wyttenbach (1706-1779), Thomas Boston (1676-1732), and John Gill (1697-1771)³⁸ defended the older orthodoxy, though often with some modifications.³⁹ Perhaps the most extensive defense of Reformed orthodoxy in this period is found in the work of the Leiden theologian, Bernhardini de Moor (1709-1780). In his seven volume *Commentarius Perpetuus*⁴⁰ on Johannes à Marck's *Compendium Theologiae*,⁴¹ he set forth a nearly

³⁶ Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 154.

³⁷ A.G Honig. *Alexander Comrie* (Utrecht: H. Honig, 1892).

³⁸ On John Gill's work, see M.A.G. Haykin, ed., *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771): A Tercentennial Appreciation* (New York: Brill, 1997).

³⁹ In Wyttenbach's case with a heavy emphasis on natural theology, following the philosophy of Wolff, see Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:83, 139-146. In Gills' case, he denied infant baptism.

⁴⁰ Bernhardinus de Moor, *Commentarius Perpetuus in Johannis Marckii Compendium theologiae didactico-elenenticum* (Lugduni-Batavia: Johannes Hasbebroek, 1761-1771). In this work, he comments on each line from Marck's *Compendium*. To get an idea of the size of this work, consider that the third volume of this work comments on chapters 14-20 of the 33 chapters of Marck's *Compendium* in 1171 pages. Marck's *Compendium* is only 809 pages.

exhaustive treatment of every question in Reformed theology. As Richard Muller comments, “The work [is] so exhaustive in its detail and bibliography that it virtually ended the development of Reformed doctrine in the form of orthodox system.”⁴²

The Doctrinal Consensus of Reformed Orthodoxy

As noted, orthodoxy refers to a content of theology and not to a method. What, then, is the content of *Reformed* orthodoxy? First, it sought to maintain the traditional creeds and confession of the early Church. There was no attempt at innovation of the doctrine of the Trinity and two natures of Christ. In addition, the Reformed orthodox held to what is considered the classic formulation of the *solas* of the Reformation: Scripture alone, Christ alone, faith alone, and grace alone over against Rome’s views of tradition, Papal authority, and the merit of good works. In addition, over against the Anabaptists and Socinians, the Reformed maintained the importance of the visible Church, the ministry, the sacraments, and infant baptism. The Reformed also followed in the

⁴¹ Marck’s dogmatic works were very important in the eighteenth century. His *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* is his larger dogmatic work, was first published in 1686, and went through three editions, the last in 1727. The Dutch translation of this work is *Mergh der Godgeleerdheid*, and it went through five editions from 1705 to 1758. Marck also produced a shorter work entitled *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, which follows the same chapters and paragraphs of the larger work but with shorter paragraphs. It was first published in 1690 in Amsterdam. A seventh edition was published in 1772, and another printing actually occurred in 1824 in Philadelphia. The *Medulla* was translated into the Dutch as *Kort Opstel* by Johannes Wilhelmius, and it went through nine editions from 1714-1770. Note that our English word “Marrow” corresponds to the smaller work in Latin and the larger work in Dutch.

⁴² Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:83.

path of Augustine in affirming “absolute predestination.”⁴³ This came to be known as the “five points of Calvinism” set in contrast to the five points of the Remonstrance. The separation with the Lutheran Church occurred over the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper when the Reformed emphasized a real but not physical presence of Christ in the Supper. In close connection to this view of the Lord’s Supper, the Reformed tended to have a much simpler worship and to desire to remove all extraneous rites and ceremonies from worship.⁴⁴

As a way of organizing all of these doctrines, Reformed orthodoxy developed a covenant theology that consisted in the covenant of works and covenant of grace.⁴⁵ The formulation of the covenant doctrine began very early. In the second half of the sixteenth century, Reformed theologians were regularly defining the doctrines of the covenant in terms

⁴³ Following the title of Girolamo Zanchius, *Absolute Predestination*, trans. Augustus Toplady, 1760 (numerous reprints).

⁴⁴ On the simplicity of worship, especially over against the Lutherans, see Good, *The Origins of the Reformed Church in Germany*. This is well stated in the *Belgic Confession* “We reject all human inventions, and all laws which man would introduce into the worship of God, thereby to bind and compel the conscience in any manner whatever” (Article XXXII). Cited from *Ecumenical and Reformed Creeds and Confessions* (Dyer, IN: Mid-America Reformed Seminary, 2000).

⁴⁵ The three covenant view does not fundamentally alter the distinction between a covenant of works and the covenant of grace. See Richard Muller, “Divine Covenants, Absolute and Conditional: John Cameron and the Early Orthodox Development of Reformed Covenant Theology,” in *Mid-America Journal of Theology of Theology* 17 (2006):11-56. For a discussion of Turretin’s interaction with Amyraut on this point, see Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 351-369. Note that Rijssen himself seems to see the Sinaitic covenant as distinct from the covenant of works and covenant of grace, see p. 102. On the development of the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, see Lyle Bierma, *German Calvinism in the Confessional Age: The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996). Note particularly chapters 2 and 5.

of the covenant of works and covenant of grace.⁴⁶ By the time of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the covenant of works and grace became confessional doctrine, even though they were taught long before by many theological writers.⁴⁷

The issue of the covenant of grace and covenant of works is of particular interest in relation to Rijssen. As we shall see below, the Reformed theologians in the Netherlands eventually divided into Cocceians and Voetians following Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669) and Voetius respectively. Often, Cocceius is seen as a founder of federal (covenantal) theology, but this can easily obscure the fact that although Reformed theologians may not have made as extensive a use of this doctrine as Cocceius did, they nearly all held to the basic structuring of redemptive history in terms of the covenant of works and covenant of grace. The major difference between the Cocceians and Voetians on this point is that Cocceians generally spend much more space discussing the history of the covenants in the Old and New Testaments.⁴⁸ Nevertheless,

⁴⁶ Amandus Polanus wrote, “An eternal covenant is a covenant in which God promises eternal life to man. And it is twofold: a covenant of works and a covenant of grace.” Cited in *Partitiones Theologicae* (London, 1591), 53. See also Franciscus Junius in *Opuscula*, 183-185 and Lucas Trelcatius, *Scholastica et Methodica Locorum Communium* (London, 1604), 107.

⁴⁷ It had already been stated in the *Irish Articles of Religion* (1615), see Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with History and Critical Notes*, 3 Vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), 3:526-544. The article containing the covenant of works is Article 21.

⁴⁸ See Johannes Cocceius, *De Leer van het Verbond en het Testament van God*, trans. W.J. van Asselt and H.G. Renger (Kampen: Uitgeverij de Groot-Goudriaan, 1990). This is even clearer in the systems of his followers. Franz Burman wrote a two volume system entitled *Synopsis Theologiae et speciatim oeconomiae Foederum Dei ab*

the Voetians often structured the arrangement of their teachings in terms of the covenant of works and covenant of grace. In fact, for Brakel, the covenant of works was so important that he could say:

Acquaintance with this covenant is of the greatest importance, for whoever errs here or denies the existence of the covenant of works, will not understand the covenant of grace, and will readily err concerning the mediatorship of the Lord Jesus.⁴⁹

In addition, as we see with Rijssen, even where the covenant of grace is treated only as one topic, there is substantive agreement on the nature of the covenant of works and covenant of grace.⁵⁰

In spite of this consensus, there was not a total uniformity of theological formulation. There was diversity in the midst of consensus, first, in the way that doctrines were formulated. In Rijssen's work, for example, there is a rejection of the terms archetypal and ectypal for

initio saeculorum usque ad consummationum eorum, 2 vols. (Utrecht: G. Clerck, 1671-2). The first volume contains prolegomena, doctrine of Scripture, and the doctrine of God like any other system but then goes on to deal with the history of the Old Testament up to the time of Christ's birth. The second volume deals with the history of the New Testament including the person and natures of Christ and justification. On another Coccejan system, that of Johannes Braunius (1628-1708), see C. Graafland, "De verschillen tussen voetianen en coccejaanse geloofsleer," in Broeyer and Wall, eds., *Een richtigenstrijd in de Gereformeerde Kerk: Voetianen en Coccejanen 1650-1750* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1994), 28-53, see particularly pp. 47-48.

⁴⁹ Wilhelmus à Brakel, *The Christian's Reasonable Service*, trans. Bartel Elshout, ed. Joel R. Beeke (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 1993), 1:355. Note that the title of Brakel's work is *The Christian's Reasonable Service: in which the Truths of the Covenant of Grace are Expounded....* See also Johannes Marckius, *Christianae Theologiae Medulla* (Amsterdam: Gerardus Borstius, 1690). His doctrine of salvation is discussed in terms of the covenant of grace, the mediator of the covenant of grace, the duties of the covenant of grace, the benefits of the covenant of grace, and the sacraments of the covenant of grace.

⁵⁰ See Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, ed. Ernst Bizer, trans. G.T. Thomson (Repr., London: The Wakeman Trust, no date), 281-300.

theology, which was otherwise almost universally accepted.⁵¹ Rijssen also says that distinctions of the will of God into revealed and hidden or into sign and good pleasure are not good ways of making distinctions in the will of God. Instead, it should be distinguished according to its objects, namely, the things that God wills to do, to command, and to permit.⁵² As Muller points out in relation to some other ways of formulating the doctrine of God, this did not cause much heated debate among the Reformed.⁵³

There were other issues that did cause much greater division within the ranks. The philosophical method of René Descartes (1596-1650) was hotly debated in the Netherlands and elsewhere. The only place this issue appears in the *SET* is in the controversy over whether it is permitted to doubt the existence of God, which is found in the controversies on the first commandment,⁵⁴ but the issues went well beyond the issue of the permissibility of doubt.⁵⁵ Besides philosophical differences, there were also divisions over such issues as the Sabbath,⁵⁶

⁵¹ See Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:233-238. See below, p.1.

⁵² See below, p. 39.

⁵³ See Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 3:216.

⁵⁴ See below, p. 177.

⁵⁵ See Theo Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch: Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy 1637-1650* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992).

⁵⁶ See H.B. Visser, *De Geschiedenis van den Sabbatsstrijds onder den Gereformeerde in de Zeventiende Eeuw* (Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon, 1939) and James

ruling Elders, Bishops, and the relation of Church and state.⁵⁷ Many of these debates occurred without a serious threat of schism, although the debate was at times bitter.

There were issues, however, that came much closer to bringing a schism in the Church. These relate primarily to the positions of the theologians associated with the Academy of Saumur in France. The Churches in Switzerland even condemned these teachings in the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*.⁵⁸ The condemnations centered around Moses Amyraut's (1596-1664) hypothetical universalism, Joshua De La Place's (1596-1665?) views on original sin, and Louis Capelle's (1585-1658) view of the vowel points of the Hebrew text.⁵⁹ At various points, Rijssen deals with these questions at one point referring to "certain Frenchmen" and sometimes to "others." More often, however, they are not mentioned by name and the controversies that also relate in some ways to the school of

Dennison, *The Market Day of the Soul: The Puritan Doctrine of the Sabbath in England, 1532-1700* (Lanham, MD: University of America Press, 1983).

⁵⁷ It is important to remember that the Anglican Church was seen by the other Reformed Churches as a Reformed Church. The English sent a delegation to the Synod of Dort. In Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere, there were often superintendents or bishops with some degree of authority. See Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, trans. George Musgrave Giger, ed. James T. Dennison (Philipsburg: P&R, 1994), XVIII.xxi.3.

⁵⁸ See J.C.W. Augustus, ed. *Corpus Librorum Symbolicum qui in Ecclesia Reformatorum auctoritatem publicam obtinuerunt* (Elberfeld: Heinrich Bueschler, 1827), 443-459.

⁵⁹ On this controversy, see Brian Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969); and Richard A. Muller, "The Debate over the Vowel Points and the Crisis in Orthodox Hermeneutics," in *After Calvin*, 146-155.

Saumur or to the Cocceians are dealt with under the heading of some other opponent such as the Arminians.⁶⁰

In Rijssen's *SET*, there is evidence of a Reformed consensus but not an utterly rigid one or total uniformity. Instead, there was clearly debate within the consensus, but, for the most part, they recognized one another as brothers. Even in the case of Saumur, it is not correct to say that the Reformed would have called them "heretics."⁶¹ Even in the case of the Arminians and Lutherans, the Reformed were hesitant to call them "heretics." Those who taught an erroneous doctrine that did not subvert the foundation of the faith would be considered schismatic.⁶²

The Situation in the Netherlands

Finally, a brief note on the theological situation in the Netherlands in which Leonard Rijssen labored is in order. After the Synod of Dort, the Reformed Church consolidated and developed. The Netherlands

⁶⁰ E.g., pp. 167-168 below.

⁶¹ The misleading title of Armstrong's book in fn. 58 might lead one to believe this. See Francis Turretin, *Institutes*, IV.xvii.12. In this paragraph Turretin notes the agreement with the universalists and says, "Whatever discrepancy of opinion may here be perceived among our men, the foundation of faith thus far remains safe on both sides through the grace of God." He then goes on to say in §13, "We all indeed agree in opposing the deadly errors of Pelagians and of those who follow their camp." At the same time, he says, "[Their view] does not cease to be encumbered with various absurdities and inextricable difficulties."

⁶² For an extensive discussion of fundamental articles, see Muller. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:406-450.

entered a golden age in virtually every field.⁶³ The Reformed universities prospered and produced many respected theologians.

J. Van Den Berg suggests that in the middle of the seventeenth century, there were three theological streams in the Reformed Church in the Netherlands.⁶⁴ These three streams are, in turn, represented, by three men at three Dutch universities: Maresius, a Frenchman at Groningen; Voetius, a Dutchman at Utrecht; and Cocceius, a German at Franeker then Leyden. The first stream he calls traditional theology (*theologia traditiva*) which was steeped in the theology of the sixteenth century and heavily emphasized the conclusions of the Synod of Dort. Voetius was also a strong proponent of Dort but with “more of a scholastic-Aristotelean accent”⁶⁵ and with a stronger relationship to the Puritan piety of England. Finally, Cocceius tended to be anti-scholastic and put much more emphasis on covenantal or federal theology than Voetius did.

⁶³ See the introduction to Jonathon Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

⁶⁴ He explains this in “Het stroomlandschap van de Gereformeerde Kerk in Nederland tussen 1650 en 1750,” in *Een richtingstrijd in de Gereformeerde Kerk: Voetianen en Coccejanen 1650-1750* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1994), 9-27. He indicates that he is following the work of Christiaan Sepp, *Godgeleerd Onderwijs in Nederland, gedurende de 16e en 17e eeuw*, 2 vols. (Leiden: De Breuk en Smits, 1873-4).

⁶⁵ Berg, “Het stroomlandschap van de Gereformeerde Kerk in Nederland tussen 1650 en 1750,” in *Een richtingstrijd in de Gereformeerde Kerk: Voetianen en Coccejanen 1650-1750*, 17.

In the latter part of the seventeenth century, there was a merger of the first two streams, which is symbolized in the reconciliation of Maresius and Voetius. They came to the realization that they should join forces to attack the “innovators.”⁶⁶ The result was that at the end of the seventeenth and into at least the nineteenth century, there was a division of the Dutch Reformed into “Cocceians” and “Voetians.” What were the issues between the two parties? For many, it may be difficult to see the difference between the two parties, for both held to the conclusions of Dort and were orthodox. The differences became most pronounced in their view of redemptive history and thus justification in the Old Testament⁶⁷ and the Sabbath, Cartesian philosophy,⁶⁸ and allegorical exegesis.⁶⁹ The Cocceians and Cocceius himself wanted to make a stronger division between the Old and New Testaments. Cocceius believed that the Sabbath law was part of the ceremonial law and had begun at Sinai and was no longer in force for the New Testament era. Although Cocceius himself was not an ardent Cartesian, many of his

⁶⁶ For an account of the conflict and reconciliation, see Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 240-282.

⁶⁷ For an excellent summary of these differences, see Willem van Asselt, “Voetius en Coccejus over de rechtvaardiging,” in *De Onbekende Voetius*, 32-47.

⁶⁸ See Theo Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch*. This is primarily an historical account of how the Dutch Reformed theologians responded to Descartes’ thought, but he also provides brief summaries of the objections and responses to Cartesian philosophy.

⁶⁹ See W.J. van Asselt, “Pierre de Joncourt en zijn protest tegen de coccejaanse exegetische in het begin van de achttiende eeuw” in *Een richtingstrijd*, 146-164.

followers were.⁷⁰ From there, other conflicts erupted which even spilled over into the political sphere.⁷¹ Rijssen himself was a leader and ardent defender of the Voetian school. Several of his writings aimed at defending the views of the Voetians in ways only hinted at in the *SET*.⁷²

Part 2 - *Summa* – Scholasticism and the Institutional Development of Reformed Orthodoxy

The word “scholasticism” is often associated with a “rigid, sterile, and predestinarian” system of doctrine, but this view ignores several key facts concerning the scholastic method, as Asselt and Rouwnedal point out in their book *Inleiding in de Gereformeerde Scholastiek*.⁷³ First, it was not only the Reformed who made use of the scholastic method. Rome and Lutheranism made use of the same method with quite different doctrinal results. Even Arminius debated against the Reformed doctrine of predestination by the use of the scholastic method.⁷⁴ Second, the scholastic method was not used only in the seventeenth century but had served as a theological method since the eleventh century. Finally,

⁷⁰ See *Descartes' Conversation with Burman*, trans. with an introduction by John Cottingham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) and Christopher Wittich, *Theologia Pacifica* (Lugduni Batavia: Cornelius Boutesteyn, 1683).

⁷¹ See M. Van Der Bijl, “De tweedracht van voetianen en coccejane in politiek perspectief,” in *Een richtingenstrijd*, 74-94.

⁷² See below in the list of works, pp. xliii-xlix.

⁷³ See Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 9-17.

⁷⁴ See Richard Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: sources and directions of Protestant scholasticism in the era of early orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991).

this method was used not only in theology but also in many other disciplines. Consequently, we should not think of scholasticism as something that determines theological content or represents a theological content but “an academic form of argument and disputation.”⁷⁵

This does not mean that Reformed theologians never used the word “scholastic” to denote a particular theological content. They used the word in a manifold sense. Rijssen’s *SET* is obviously scholastic in method and form and intended for an academic audience. Nevertheless, he condemns the “scholastics” by which he most likely means some of the medieval theologians and some of his contemporary Roman Catholic scholastic theologians.⁷⁶

Since scholasticism is a form of argumentation and academic exercise, one should not assume that its use signifies an abandonment of the Bible, the doctrines of the Reformers, or a lack of interest in piety. Rather, the rise of Reformed scholasticism is directly related to an institutionalizing of Reformed orthodoxy and the rise of Protestant academies and universities.⁷⁷ In reality, the Reformed scholastic

⁷⁵ Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 9, and note also the same point in Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:34-37.

⁷⁶ See *Ibid.*, 73-75; Muller *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:34-37; and below, pp. 84, 112, and 121.

⁷⁷ See Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 90-111. “Na de kerkhervorming zagen de gereformeerde kerken zich vanwege het wegvallen van de rooms-katholieke organisatiestructuur voor de taak gesteld zich als instituut te profileren en in te richten. Er moet een confessionele basis worden gelegd, kerkelijke organisaties moesten opgebouwd worden en er moest gezorgd worden voor een goede opleiding van predikanten” (95).

theologians were attempting to make tools available to students and Pastors that could be used to simplify academic labor. A good example of this is what Olivier Fatio outlines in his book *Methode et Théologie*.⁷⁸ He notes that Niels Hemmingsen asked Daneau to develop a method for interpreting every verse of Scripture. Daneau responded by writing his *Methodus tractandae sacrae scripturae* (1579).⁷⁹ In this work, he sets forth a method for dealing with every verse according to its rhetorical context, internal logic, and theology. In “theology,” he included analysis of words, application, theological argumentation, and refutation of heretical uses of the verse.⁸⁰ Whether or not we like what these men did or agree with it, we must recognize that what Daneau was doing is not that different from what professors do today in trying to teach their own students how to exegete Scripture.

In Daneau’s work, we begin to see that the Reformed were not only interested in doing systematic theology in an academic way, they were also very interested in Biblical exegesis. The seventeenth century was not only a time of great production in systematic theology but also in Biblical study and commentary. To name just a few examples, Johannes Cocceius wrote commentaries on the entire Bible as well as the standard

⁷⁸ Olivier Fatio, *Methode et Théologie: Lambert Daneau et les debuts de la scholastique réformée* (Geneva: Droz, 1976). The discussion of exegesis is on pp. 63-87.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 64-72.

Hebrew lexicon of his day. Johannes à Marck obtained fame for his work in systematic theology,⁸¹ but he also wrote commentaries on various parts of the Pentateuch, the Minor Prophets, and Revelation. Samuel Maresius, who wrote mostly polemical and systematic works,⁸² also prepared a new edition of the French Bible with notes.⁸³ Furthermore, consider that Johannes Heidegger in his *Enchiridion*,⁸⁴ a prolegomena to the study of the Bible, listed twenty-one Reformed commentators on the book of Matthew⁸⁵ besides the thirty-five commentators who commented on all the books of the New Testament.⁸⁶ On the Old Testament, he

⁸¹ See n. 41.

⁸² See Nauta's list in *Samuel Maresius*, 3-39.

⁸³ *La Sainte Bible, qui contient le vieux et le nouveau Testament. Edition nouvelle, faite sur la version de Geneve, reveue, et corrigée; enrichie, outre les anciennes Notes, de toutes celles de la Bible Flamande, de la pluspart de celles de M. Diodati, et de beaucoup d'autres; de plusieurs Cartes curieuses, et de Tables fort amples, pour le soulagement de ceux qui lisent l'Ecriture Sainte. Le tout disposé en cet ordre, par les soins de Samuel des Marets, Docteur et premier Professeur en Theologie en l'Université Provinciale de Groningue et d'Ommelande, et de Henry des Marets son fils, Ministre du S. Evangile en l'Eglise Française de Delft*, (Amsterdam: Louis et Daniel Elzevier, 1669). It is contained in two folio volumes.

⁸⁴ Johannes Heinrich Heidegger, *Enchiridion Biblicum*, 5th ed. (Jena: Johannes Felicius Beilckius, 1723).

⁸⁵ See *Ibid.*, 474, where he lists, for example, Daneau, Gomarus, Heidegger, Junius, Munster, Musculus, Oeclampadius, both Spanheims, Pareus, Huizenga, Rombout, van Til, Dixon, Fuller, Perkins, Ward, Phillip, Tyndale, Blackmod, Moor, and others who comment on parts of it.

⁸⁶ See *Ibid.*, 456, where he lists Aretius, Betulejus, Beza, Bullinger, Calvin, Cameron, Capel, Coccejus, Crojus, Drusius, Gualtherus, Heinsius, Marloratus, Obenheim, Piscator, Strigelius, Tossanus, Wissius (Felix), Zwingli, Herlinus, Bridges, Cartrwright, Fulco, Gattaker, Hammond, Knathbull, Leigh, Lightfoot, Poole, Priceaus, Tyndale, Mayer, Matthew, Boisius, and Doughtejus.

listed thirteen commentators on the book of Judges⁸⁷ in addition to the twenty commentators who commented on all of the O.T. books.⁸⁸ Note that this refers only to Reformed commentators. This does not refer to Jewish, patristic, Lutheran, and Papist commentators, whom these theologians used extensively.⁸⁹ In Rijssen, there is only a small glimpse of the extensive Biblical exegesis behind his many citations of Scripture.

Even though these men wrote academic works, they also knew the difference between academic and popular writings. They were also intensely interested in promoting knowledge, piety, and godliness among the common people. The devotional writings of men like Owen, Rutherford, and other Puritans are well-known, but many others are less known. Voetius, perhaps the greatest scholastic theologian of the age, was deeply interested in piety, wrote several works on it, and urged “the marriage of learning and piety.”⁹⁰ Turretin, who is well-known, for his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, was a regular preacher, and his sermons

⁸⁷ See *Ibid.*, 74, where he lists Borrhaus, Bucer, Burman, Calvin, Drusius, Lavater, Martyr, Strigelius, Wolphius, Arthur, Jackson, Mayer, and Roger.

⁸⁸ See *Ibid.*, 16-17, where he lists Amama, Bibliander, De Dieu, Bootius, Diodati, Gryaneus, Junius, Maresius, Munster, Pareus, Pellican, Piscator, Ridder, Schotanus, Stephanus, Toassanus, Zanchi, Hallus, the English Annotations, Causinus, Lightfoot, Poole’s *Synopsis Criticorum*, Richardson, Samson, Talon, Ussher, Armagh, Worthington, Ainsworth, and Hugo Gortius.

⁸⁹ See Matthew Poole, *Synopsis Criticorum*, 5 vols. (Frankfurt ad Moenum: Balthasar Christopher Wustius, 1694).

⁹⁰ See Johannes Hoornbeeck and Gisbertus Voetius, *Spiritual Desertion* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003); and Joel R. Beeke, *Gisbertus Voetius: Toward a Reformed Marriage of Knowledge and Piety* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 1999).

illustrate a warm and devout piety that he adapted to his hearers.⁹¹ Petrus Van Mastricht (1636-1706) wrote *Theoretico-Practica Theologia* in which he set forth not only the doctrinal, exegetical, and polemical aspects of each topic but also their practical significance.⁹² There are many other examples, but from a review of virtually any of the major theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is easy to see that these men wrote academic works (usually in Latin) and popular works (usually in the common language). The former made use of the scholastic method, and the latter made use of oratory.⁹³

Part 3 - *Elenctic* or Polemical Theology

In 1573, Lambert Daneau published *Elenchi Haereticorum*, in which he set forth a method for refuting heretics. This book is basically a logic textbook with examples taken from theological disputation. He explained that logic was the method “common to all the sciences and every art that is taught for confirming what is proper to them and for

⁹¹ Francis Turretin, *Sermons sur diuers passages de l'écriture sainte* (Geneva: S. De Tournes, 1676); and *Recueil de sermons sur divers textes de l'écritures pour l'état present de l'église* (Geneva: S. De Tournes, 1686). Note that these are two distinct collections and not different editions of the same work.

⁹² See Adriaan Neele, *The Art of Living to God: A Study of the Method and Piety in the Theoretico-practica theologia of Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706)* (Pretoria: University of Pretoria, 2005).

⁹³ See Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 68-75. “De retorische benadering zullen we eerder aantreffen in homiletische en populair-theologische geschriften, het scholastieke genre in een academische en polemische context” (75).

removing that which does not belong to them.”⁹⁴ Daneau applied this particularly to theology and wrote that the legitimate method for teaching doctrine “consists on the one hand in the assertion and confirmation of the true doctrine and on the other hand in refutation of that which opposes it.”⁹⁵ Daneau recognized and argued that he was far from the first to use this method. He pointed first of all to the Scripture, then to the Church Fathers, and then to earlier reformers such as Melanchthon and Calvin.⁹⁶ What Daneau attempted to provide was a method for doing what theologians had been doing all along.

In the seventeenth century, as we have already noted, the elenctic or polemical aspect of theology became even more pronounced. Probably the most influential on Rijssen was John Hoornbeeck who was known as a great polemicist in the seventeenth century and was a close associate of Voetius.⁹⁷ In his *Summa Controversarium*,⁹⁸ he provides a history and summary of the debate with Gentiles, Jews, Muslims, and Rome, among others, and gives a list of questions over which there is disagreement. In

⁹⁴ Cited in Fatio, *Methode et Theologie*, 35.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 53, n.1. “Omnis recta et legitima doctrinae tradendae ratio et methodus duabus partibus simpliciter mihi constare visa est, quarum altera in veri dogmatis assertionem atque confirmationem versatur; altera in refutationem contrarii.”

⁹⁶ Ibid., 46-47, 50-51.

⁹⁷ I infer this merely from the close connection of Hoornbeeck and Rijssen in the Voetian circle.

⁹⁸ Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversarium* (Trajecti ad Rhenum: Johannes a Waesberg, 1653).

his *Socinianismi Confutati Compendium*, he takes the questions listed in the *Summa Controversarium* and gives answers with scholastic argumentation by providing a statement of the question, distinctions necessary to its resolution, arguments and answers to objections.⁹⁹ Perhaps the most well-known example of Reformed elenctic theology is Francis Turretin's *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. This work deals with many of the major questions at issue between the Reformed and their opponents. Rijssen himself appreciated this work, and he published a one-volume abridgement of it.¹⁰⁰ Finally, as one further example, this method was also taken up in Marck's *Christianae Theologiae Medulla Didactico-Elencticae*. He explains each doctrine and then refutes the objections that various opponents raise against each teaching.¹⁰¹

The major opponents of the Reformed in the seventeenth century were the Roman Catholics; Anabaptists; Lutherans; Socinians; and Arminians. We shall deal with each of these opponents in the order in which they historically came into conflict with the Reformed. There are other opponents as well of lesser significance, and we will provide brief explanations of these opponents in footnotes of the translation of the *SET*.

⁹⁹ Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Socinianismi Confutati Compendium* (Lugduni Batavia: Felice Lopez, 1690).

¹⁰⁰ See below on Rijssen's works, xlviiii-xlix.

¹⁰¹ See n. 41.

Rome

The first opponent of the Reformed is obviously Rome. The polemic against Rome is older than the Reformation itself.¹⁰² Once the Reformation took place, this polemic only continued to increase.

Already before 1546, there was a great deal of debate over the Protestant doctrines of Scripture, sacraments, and justification, among others. In the middle of the sixteenth century, two major events occurred that defined the controversy between Rome and the Protestants throughout the next century and a half. The first was the Council of Trent. The second was the rise of the Jesuits.

First, the Council of Trent was the response of Rome to the Reformation. In many ways, there was more openness in regards to these doctrines before this Council, but afterwards the door was shut.¹⁰³ The result was a strengthening of Rome's doctrinal position and thereby an increased attack on the Protestants and positive formulation of Romanist dogma in terms of it.

Second, Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556) founded the order of the Jesuits in the 1530s. The Society of Jesus rapidly gained power and

¹⁰² In other words, there were theologians such as Huss and Wycliffe who had already opposed Romanist doctrine.

¹⁰³ On this phenomenon, see "The Definition of Roman Catholic Particularity" in Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)*, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984), 4:245-303. He describes a similar phenomenon in reaction to the Reformation in Eastern Orthodoxy in *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 2:280-295.

members. They were devoted to the Pope and were the “shock troops” of the Counter-Reformation. They are particularly significant for the *SET* because from their ranks came the most prominent opponents of the Reformation.

Asselt and Dekker point out that in the seventeenth century, there was not one “scholastic” method but three. They distinguish these methods into Reformed, Lutheran, and Spanish scholasticism. The Spanish scholasticism came from the Iberian peninsula (thus including Portugal), and they produced a powerful polemic against the Reformation. The two most prominent writers of this Spanish scholasticism were Luis de Molina (1535-1600) and Francisco Suarez (1548-1617). Their influence may be seen in the fact that some works of Suarez, including his most influential *Disputationes Metaphysicae*,¹⁰⁴ were in the libraries of Voetius and Gomarus.¹⁰⁵

Of course, Rome had a great tradition of theological definition and argumentation, and many scholars made use of this tradition in order to attack the Protestants. We will note briefly two of the most prominent: Cardinal Joseph Bellarmine (1542-1621) and Martin Becanus (1563-1624). Both of these men were Jesuits. Both of these men have

¹⁰⁴ Franciscus Suarez, *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, vols. 25 and 26 of *Opera Omnia* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1965).

¹⁰⁵ All this information in this paragraph is taken from W.J. van Asselt and Eef Dekker, *De Scholastieke Voetius: Een luisteroefening ann de hand van Voetius’ Disputationes Selectae* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1995), 10-12.

connections with the Netherlands. Becanus was from the Spanish Netherlands. Bellarmine taught at the prominent school at Louvain in Spanish Netherlands for seven years. Both of these men are actually cited specifically in Rijssen's *SET* in two of his very few citations of other works.

Cardinal Bellarmine is the most prominent of the Romanist controversialists.¹⁰⁶ He published his *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei* in four large volumes from 1581-93 in Ingolstadt, Germany. It went through many editions up to the 19th century. It was this work that provided a foil for many Protestant polemicists in the late sixteenth and seventeenth century. To mention just a few, William Ames responded to the whole work in his *Bellarminus Enervatus*.¹⁰⁷ Lucas Trelcatius, Sr. (1542-1602) included a polemical section primarily aimed at Bellarmine in each *locus* of his *Loci Communes*.¹⁰⁸ Sibbrandus Lubbertus (1556-1625), a professor at Franeker, wrote several books dealing with specific topics of Bellarmine.¹⁰⁹ In addition, books like

¹⁰⁶ The popular biography of Bellarmine is James Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine: Saint and Scholar* (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1961). This is an abridgement of an earlier two volume work. A discussion of Bellarmine's theology is found in Joseph de la Serviere, *La théologie de Bellarmin* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1909).

¹⁰⁷ William Ames, *Bellarminus Enervatus in 4 Tomos Divisus* (Oxford, 1625-29).

¹⁰⁸ Note the English translation: *A Brief Institution of the Common Places of Sacred Divinity wherein, the truth of every place is proved and the sophisms of Bellarmine reproved* (London: Francis Burton, 1610).

¹⁰⁹ See C. Van Der Woude's chapter on "Polemiek tegen Bellarminus", *Sibbrandus Lubbertus, Leven en Werken* (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1963), 60-110. He lists *De Principiis Christianorum Dogmatum* (1591), *De Papa Romano* (1594), *De Conciliis* (1601), and *De Ecclesia* (1607).

Andrew Willet's (1562-1621) *Synopsis Papismi*¹¹⁰ deal extensively with Bellarmine as do other refutations of Romanist dogma. One could almost say that Bellarmine's *Disputationes* created a Protestant cottage industry of theological refutation.

The second example is Martin Becanus. He wrote many works including *Summa Theologiae Scholasticae*, which is primarily a summary of Suarez's commentary on Thomas Aquinas.¹¹¹ For our purposes, most notable is his *Manuale Controversarium*, published in 1623 at Mainz. It was extremely popular and published in many editions well into the eighteenth century.¹¹² This work is particularly interesting because Becanus provides a Roman Catholic parallel to what Rijssen was trying to do. He was trying to provide a manual for students to use in their arguments with the Protestants, just as Rijssen was doing for Reformed students. Both make use of the scholastic method, and both produced very different results. Becanus' book is an example of how Rome was trying diligently to fight against its opponents through publication and instruction.

The contents of Becanus' book give insight into the differences between Rome and the Reformed. The *Manuale* is divided into five books.

¹¹⁰ Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi* (London: Thomas Man, 1592).

¹¹¹ It was originally published in 1612 at Mainz. The information from its contents is from The Catholic Encyclopedia (Document online: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02380a.htm>).

¹¹² This work was originally published in 1623. I have used Martin Becanus, *Manuale Controversarium* (Cologne: Francis Metternich, 1696).

They concern arguments that Rome had with the Protestants in general, the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Anabaptists, and the Erastians (*politicos*) respectively. The eighteen chapters of “Book I” provide a list of Rome’s disagreement with Protestantism and are mirrored in the *SET*. They concern Scripture, traditions, the Church, the judge of controversies, the antichrist, the invocation of saints, purgatory, communion of both kinds, the sacrifice of the mass, the sacraments in general, the calling of Ministers, clerical celibacy, sin, free will, justification, keeping of the law, and the merit of good works. Most of these controversies appear in the *SET* in the chapters on Scripture (2), the Church (16), and the sacraments (17). Becanus also listed controversies specifically with the “Calvinists” over the divine attributes, Christ, predestination, grace, the author of sin, the real presence, the necessity of infant baptism, exorcism, images of Christ, and the “circular argument of the Calvinists” concerning the authority of Scripture.

Bellarmino and Becanus provide just two examples of the controversy carried on with the Reformed. It is helpful to understand how forcefully the Reformed were being attacked in order to understand their lengthy argumentations and the formation of seventeenth century Reformed theology. It is also not surprising that, in such a climate, someone would want to publish a manual like the *SET* to help students remember and use Biblical and rational arguments against their opponents.

The Anabaptists

The Anabaptists were the first to take the Protestant doctrines in a “radical” direction. When the Reformation began under Luther and Zwingli, in both cases, there were those who wanted to take it “further.”

There was a great diversity of belief among the Anabaptists. Thomas Müntzer is famous for his revolution, but many of the Anabaptists held to pacifism. They did not have extensive confessions. Owen Chadwick describes their one common confession:

The so-called Anabaptist Confession of Schleithem (1527), the document nearest to a confession agreed by the early Anabaptists, proclaimed adult baptism and separation from the world, including everything popish, and from attendance at parish churches and taverns. It condemned the use of force, or going to law, or becoming a Magistrate, or the taking of oaths.¹¹³

This confession describes many of the issues that we find considered in Rijssen’s work.

Within the Netherlands, the Anabaptists were called “Mennonites” after the early leader of the Anabaptists in the Netherlands, Menno Simons (1505-1561), and this is how Rijssen refers to the Anabaptists in the *SET*, though we will use the more common term “Anabaptist” in the translation. Menno Simons left behind many writings in which he defended his views.¹¹⁴ Maurice Hansen describes Menno’s most

¹¹³ Owen Chadwick, *The Pelican History of the Church: The Reformation* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1990), 3:189.

¹¹⁴ See the *Complete Works of Menno Simons* (Elkhart, IN: John F. Funk and Brother, 1871). Also available online at <http://www.e-menno.org/menno/menno000.htm>.

controversial doctrine: “Menno taught a fantastical doctrine. He believed that the birth of Jesus had been only in appearance; that he had not received from the Virgin Mary his flesh and blood, but had brought them from heaven.”¹¹⁵ There is a refutation of this teaching in Chapter Eleven of the *SET*.

After Menno’s death, the Mennonites were divided into two groups: the fine, which was the more rigid, and the coarse, which had abandoned some of the severity of the sect. They were also further divided during the Arminian controversy into Remonstrant and predestinarian groups.¹¹⁶ Thus, the controversy with the Mennonites continued, but it was not as severe as it was in the 1st half of the sixteenth century.

The Lutherans

The Lutheran controversy has always been one of the bitterest controversies in which the Reformed Church has engaged because of the similarity of Reformed and Lutheran doctrine and the high esteem in which the Reformed have always held Luther.¹¹⁷ This controversy dates to the earliest time of the Reformation and the difference between Luther

¹¹⁵ Maurice Hanson, *The Reformed Church in the Netherlands* (New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America, 1884), 49. For an examples of this, see Menno’s works, especially his various debates with Micron in his *Works*.

¹¹⁶ See J.H. Kurtz, *Church History*, 3 Vols. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1888-90), 3:68-69.

¹¹⁷ See Herman J. Selderhuis, “Luther Totus Noster Est: the Reception of Luther’s Thought at the Hedelberg Theological Faculty 1583-1622” in *Mid-America Journal of Theology* 17 (2006):101-120.

and Zwingli on the Lord's Supper. At the Colloquy of Marburg in 1529, organized by Philip of Hesse, Zwingli and Luther agreed on all but one of sixteen articles, namely, the one on the Lord's Supper. The controversy continued throughout the sixteenth century, and the Lord's Supper continued to be the major dividing point between the Reformed and the Lutherans along with its various subsidiary doctrines.¹¹⁸

After Luther's death in 1546, Lutheranism divided into two factions. The first consisted of the followers of Philip Melanchthon and were known as Philippists. They held a more moderate view of the Lord's Supper, and they were prepared to a much greater degree to seek union with the Reformed. On the other side, the Genesio-Lutherans or the "true" Lutherans were staunchly opposed to the Reformed.¹¹⁹

Melanchthon died in 1560, and his followers did not consolidate as the Genesio-Lutherans did. For example, one of his students, Zacharias Ursinus, came to Switzerland after the death of Melanchthon, embraced the Reformed view of predestination, and became one of the leaders of the Reformed Church.¹²⁰ In 1577, the Lutherans compiled the Formula of Concord, in which they condemned the "Calvinists" by name.¹²¹ The

¹¹⁸ For example, see Rijssen below for examples in theology (pp. 3-4), election (pp. 60-61), and perseverance of the saints (pp. 168-169).

¹¹⁹ See J.I. Good, *Origin of the Reformed Churches*, 95-110. See also the discussion of this point in Eric W. Gritsch, *A History of Lutheranism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

¹²⁰ On Ursinus, see Good, *Origin*, 132-136.

¹²¹ See *Ibid.*, 207-216.

Philippists, who were much more inclined toward ecumenicity with the Reformed, were not ready to go along with the Formula. Eventually, most of the Melancthonian party joined the Reformed Church.¹²²

With the consolidation of Lutheran belief through the Formula of Concord and the departure of the moderate wing of Lutheranism, the dividing lines between the Reformed and the Lutherans became much starker. The seventeenth century was not only the era of Reformed scholasticism but also of Lutheran scholasticism.¹²³ The greatest of the Lutheran theologians was John Gerhard whose nine-volume *Loci Communes* is one of the largest of the period in a time of large dogmatic works!¹²⁴ Gerhard was also a promoter of Biblical piety, as his writings illustrate.¹²⁵ We can see in the *SET* how the original controversies over predestination and the Lord's Supper spill over into the other topics of theology as well.

¹²² Ibid. This is really the storyline of the entire book.

¹²³ On Lutheran scholasticism, see Robert D. Preus, *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*, 2 vols. (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970-72). For an older work that covers all the common topics of theology similar to Heppe, see Heinrich Schmid, *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Verified from the Original Sources*, trans. Charles A. Hay & Henry E. Jacobs (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1899).

¹²⁴ Johann Gerhard, *Loci theologici* (9 vols), ed. Robert Preuss (Berlin, 1863-75). For a shorter compendium of Lutheran scholastic theology, see Leonard Hutter, *Compendium Locorum Theologicorum* (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1855). Note also the English translation, *Compend of Lutheran Theology*, trans. H.E. Jacobs and G.F. Spieker (Philadelphia: The Lutheran Bookstore, 1868).

¹²⁵ See the excellent material in his *Sacred Meditations* (Malone, TX: Repristination Press, 2000).

The Socinians

The central conflict with the Socinians was the doctrine of the Trinity. From the beginning of the Reformation, there were struggles over the doctrine of the Trinity. Many of the Anabaptists questioned aspects of this doctrine. Calvin's controversy with Servetus is well-known, but opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity was epitomized in the Socinians.¹²⁶

The Socinian movement originated in the Italian Sozzini family in the context of the religious freedom of Poland. Before the Sozzini came to Poland, there was already a flourishing anti-Trinitarian movement in Poland. In 1580, Faustus Socinus came to Poland and lived there until his death in 1604. He gave organization, scholarship, and a name to the movement.¹²⁷

The Socinian movement centered in Rakow, Poland, where the Socinians had a seminary and a printing press. This is the origin of the name of their major confession, *The Racovian Catechism*.¹²⁸ This Socinian haven lasted into the 1630s, when their patron from the Sieneski family became Catholic. By 1640, the seminary and the press

¹²⁶ For the history of the Trinitarian doctrine in this era, See Richard Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4:59-140.

¹²⁷ See the various accounts in Stanislaw Lubieniecki, *History of the Polish Reformation and Nine Other Related Documents*, ed. George H. Williams (Harvard Theological Studies 37) (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

¹²⁸ *The Racovian Catechism* with notes and illustrations, translated from the Latin with an historical introduction by Thomas Rees (London: Longman, Horst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818).

were closed, and the Socinians fled to other parts of Europe.¹²⁹ In 1658, Casimir, the new ruler of Poland, forced all antitrinitarians to recant their views or leave Poland.¹³⁰

The controversies with the Socinians did not end with the extinction of their haven in Racow or their dispersion. The Socinians left Poland and went to Germany, England, and the Netherlands. When the States-General of Holland issued an edict against them in 1653, many of them joined the Arminians.¹³¹ The result was a sort of hybrid of Socinianism and Remonstrantism. In addition, the major works of the Socinians became more widely available. Richard Muller writes:

The publication in 1656 of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* also marks a significant point in the development of seventeenth-century antitrinitarianism, for although many of the Socinian works had already appeared in print separately, they were not universally accessible. The appearance of the *Bibliotheca* in six folio volumes not only made the Socinian materials available broadly, it also exhibited the scope and skill of the Socinian exegetes and theologians, placing together for the first time the most substantial antitrinitarian theology of the era and its extensive exegetical foundation.¹³²

Consequently, the seventeenth century did not mark a downturn in Socinian theology but an increase and development. In response,

¹²⁹ Chadwick, *Reformation*, 202.

¹³⁰ Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4:93.

¹³¹ Kurtz, *Church History*, 68. See also W.J. Kühler, *Het Socinianisme in Nederland* (Leiden: Sijthoff, 1912).

¹³² Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4:93.

Reformed theologians were forced to do battle with these sophisticated opponents in order to maintain their positions.¹³³

The *SET* shows that the controversy with the Socinians became as extensive as that with the Papists, if not more so. Rijssen lists ninety-nine controversies with the Papists and ninety-eight with the Socinians. There were controversies over natural theology, the nature of God, the Trinity, original sin and free will, the work of Christ, the nature of the Church, and eschatology. The Socinians launched a wholesale attack on the theology of Protestantism from the opposite direction of Rome. For example, Rome made church membership necessary for salvation. The Socinians refuted that doctrine by denying that church membership was necessary at all. The Reformed responded that it was necessary for reasons other than salvation.¹³⁴ As a result, we can see that the Reformed were forced to fight a two front war against Rome and against the radical reformation. It is important to understand that the theology of the seventeenth century is not simply the result of a reaction against

¹³³ For other works on Socinianism, see Philip Dixon, *Nice and Hot Disputes: The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventeenth Century* (London: T&T Clark, 2003); Alan Gomes, "De Jesu Christo Salvatore: Faustus Socinus on the Satisfaction of Christ" in *Westminster Theological Journal* 55 (1993):209-231; Ibid., "Faustus Socinus," "De Jesu Christo Salvatore" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1990); H.J. McLachlan, *Socinianism in 17th Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951); Richard H. Popkin and Arjo Vanderjagt, eds., *Skepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New York: E.J. Brill, 1992); E.M. Wilbur. *A History of Unitarianism and its Antecedents* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946); George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1982).

¹³⁴ For another example of this argumentation, see Hoornbeck, *Socinianismi Confutati Compendium*, 857-866.

Rome but a counter-reaction to the radical reformation of the Socinians and other radical movements as well.

The Arminians

The last opponent is probably the most well-known to the Reformed, the Arminians. The origin of the controversy between the Reformed and the Arminians was in the Netherlands, and therefore was particularly important for Rijssen and other Voetians. The Arminians or Remonstrants arose as a result of the work of James Arminius,¹³⁵ who taught at Leiden University until his death in 1609. The name “Remonstrants” came from the five point remonstrance that the followers of Arminius sent to the States of Holland in 1610 explaining their views and requesting toleration for them. They held to free will in matters of salvation and predestination on the basis of foreseen faith rather than on God’s mere good pleasure. These articles were condemned in the Synod of Dort (1618-1619). The Arminians were then expelled from the State Church, and for a while many were forced into exile.

The Arminian controversy is well-known, as is the life of Arminius, but the work of the Arminians after the Synod of Dort is much less well-known. Nevertheless, during the seventeenth century, the Arminians were very active in the Netherlands, and there were still Arminians

¹³⁵ See Carl Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) and Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius*.

battling against the Reformed in the Netherlands (and elsewhere) during the seventeenth century. This provided good reason for the Reformed to carry on the debate with the Arminians.

Simon Episcopius (1583-1643) succeeded Arminius at Leiden in 1610, and after the Synod of Dort, he continued to be one of the most prominent leaders of the Arminians.¹³⁶ In 1634, he left the Remonstrant Church at Rotterdam to start a new theological school at Amsterdam.¹³⁷ His works contain numerous defenses of the Arminians against the attacks of Reformed theologians.¹³⁸ He was succeeded at the Amsterdam Academy by Étienne de Courcelles (1586-1659) and then by Philip van Limborch, who was professor there from 1667 to 1712. The last was a prominent scholar in Europe and a good friend of John Locke.¹³⁹ Limborch's *Theologia Christiana ad Praxin Pietatis ac Promotionem Pacis Christianae unice directe* was published in Amsterdam in 1686 and went through several editions.¹⁴⁰ This book is a continuing Remonstrant plea

¹³⁶ On Episcopius' life, see A.H. Haentjans, *Simon Episcopius Als Apolgeet van het Remonstrantisme in zijn leven en werken geschetst* (Leiden: A.H. Adriani, 1899) and Frederick Calder, *Memoirs of Simon Episcopius* (London: Haywood and Moore, 1838).

¹³⁷ A. W. Harrison, *Arminianism* (London: Duckworth, 1937), 108.

¹³⁸ Simon Episcopius, *Opera Theologica*, 2 Pars. (Amsterdam: Joannes Blaeu, 1650-1665). Note that this work consists in four volumes in two folio volumes. It seems that only the first part was printed in London in 1678. The first part begins with his *Institutiones Theologicae*. The second part begins with his commentary on Matthew.

¹³⁹ Harrison, *A History of Arminianism*, 116. See also P.J. Barnouw, *Philippus van Limborch* (Den Haag: Mouton & Co., 1963).

¹⁴⁰ It went through seven Latin editions from 1686-1735. It was translated into Dutch in 1701 and translated and printed in English as *A Compleat System or Body of Divinity* (London, 1713).

for more theological freedom and a thorough defense of the same Remonstrant doctrine defended in the five points of the Remonstrance of 1610. Of course, by this time, this controversy extended into other areas as well, as the *SET* illustrates. Once again, it is apparent that the Reformed were faced with many scholarly opponents in the seventeenth century and had need of a manual for defending Reformed doctrine.

The Attitude of the Reformed toward Their Opponents

Having dealt with the major opponents of the Reformed Church in the seventeenth century, it is important to note that there are other opponents as well that we have not mentioned in this introduction such as the Muslims, the Atheists, and Conrad Vorstius. Other Reformed theologians dealt with these opponents more extensively.¹⁴¹

One might get the impression from this brief introduction and from Rijssen's work itself that the Reformed viewed all their opponents equally. In the *Compendium of Turretin* Rijssen provided a "Catalogue of Ancient and Modern Heretics and Schismatics."¹⁴² In this list, he explained that there are those who are outside the Church and those who have defected (*defecerunt*) from the Church.¹⁴³ Those who are

¹⁴¹ See Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversarium*.

¹⁴² For bibliographic information, see below, pp. xliii-xlix.

¹⁴³ Francis Turretin, *Compendium Theologiae Didactico-Elencticae ex Theologorum Nostrorum Institutionibus Theologicis auctum et illustratum*, ed. Leonard Rijssen (Amsterdam: George Gallet, 1695), 286.

outside the Church are the pagans, Mohammedans, and the Jews. The second category is of those who have defected from the Church, including both heretics and schismatics. “Schismatics,” explained Rijssen, “are those who rashly or unjustly secede from those who are either their brothers or Pastors in the matter of religion, and refuse to have communion with them (*communicare*). We place the Lutherans and Arminians among them.”¹⁴⁴ Rijssen does note, however, that there are differences among the Reformed on this point. He has a *quaestio* over whether the Arminians should be numbered among the heretics. His response is that insofar as they hold to the articles of faith and do not condemn the truth that they oppose, they are not heretics, although they dangerously err. On the other side, there are those who say that they are heretics because of their fellowship with the Socinians.¹⁴⁵

Rijssen also provides an extensive list of ancient heretics. He defines heretics as those who “err in some central (*capitali*) and fundamental doctrine of the faith with pride and obstinacy and are infected with it to such a point that there is an abandonment of the Church connected with their error.”¹⁴⁶ He lists as the Western heretics

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 287.

¹⁴⁵ “De his quaeritur: an inter Schismaticos vel haereticos numerandi? Resp. Quatenus insistent fidei articulis, et veritatem oppositam non condemnant, non sunt haeretici, sed periculose errant. Alia tamen ratio illorum, qui cum Socinianis colludunt” (Ibid.).

¹⁴⁶ “Haeretici sunt, qui errore aliquot capitali et fundamentali in doctrina fidei, cum superbia et pertinacia, adeoque Ecclesiae derelictione conjuncto imbuti sunt” (Ibid., 288).

the Anabaptists because of their condemnation of infant baptism as wicked and their consequent condemnation of the Reformed as true Churches as well as their Christology, perfectionism, denial of the ministry, their low view of the Old Testament, their denial of the political order, and community of goods. He lists twenty-eight errors which constitute the Papists heretics such as their view of the Word of God, the Pope, the Church, the sacraments, the fall, free will, grace, justification, prayer, fasts, and alms. He also considers the Socinians heretics because they deny that Christ is God, that He has the same position as the patriarchs and prophets, and that Christ's death was not a satisfaction properly so-called.¹⁴⁷ Thus, of the five principal groups with which he contended, he considered only three to be heretical.

The Reformed opponents of the seventeenth century had many powerful and persistent theologians. This is why the use of the scholastic method by the Reformed theologians in their defense of their doctrine and practice was so prominent. They were not merely dealing with popular errors but the academic attacks of powerful theologians. On the other side, in light of the great theological conflict, it is not surprising that Rijssen saw the need for a manual for defending the Reformed faith so that students could memorize the arguments and be ready to refute those who opposed them.

¹⁴⁷ See the full list on p. 288.

Part 4 - Rijssen's Life and Work

Leonard Rijssen (c. 1636-c. 1700) wrote many theological works, was an influential theologian in the Netherlands, and was active in the controversies of his day in the Netherlands, but no study of any significant size has ever been done on his life.¹⁴⁸ In part, this is due to the fact that there are so many theologians of much greater stature in that period: Hoornbeeck, Voetius, Burman, Cocceius, Marck, Witsius, and others.¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, in virtually every treatment of the history of the Church in the Netherlands in the second half of the seventeenth century, one will find his name mentioned in various contexts.¹⁵⁰ He was born around 1636 in Doesburg, a city in the eastern part of the Netherlands. There is a record of him studying at Utrecht in 1654, but it

¹⁴⁸ There are biographical entries under Leonard Rijssenius in Barend Glasius, ed. *Godgeleerd Nederland: Biographisch Woordenboek van Nederlandsche Godgeleerden*, 3 vols. ('s-Hertogenbosch: Muller, 1851-1856) 3:247; P.C. Molthuysen, *Nieuwe Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 10 vols. (Leiden: A.W. Sijthof, 1911-1937) 4:1190; and Theodor Mahlmann, "Rijssen, Leonard Van," *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon*, (Document online: http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/r/rijssen_1.shtml), 8:355-361.

¹⁴⁹ We should also mention that there has hardly been sufficient study done on even the most important of these theologians. For example, there are not even full-length studies on Marck and Burman, who were much more influential than Rijssen and were professors of theology.

¹⁵⁰ See for example, Asselt and Rouwendal, *Inleiding*, 129; Broeyer and Wall, *Een richtingstrijd*, 135, 144, 162; J.H. Scholten, *De Leer Der Hervormde Kerk* (Leiden: P. Engels, 1870), I:73, 250, 283, etc.; Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*; Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 304. Alexander Schweitzer, *Die Glaubenslehre der Evangelisch-Reformirten Kirche* (Zürich: Orell, Fussli, und Comp., 1847).

is not known when he began. In 1660 or before, he obtained his doctoral degree.¹⁵¹

In 1655, Rijssen became the preacher at Tull and 't Waal, a small village in Utrecht. In 1659, he accepted a call to Heusden, the birthplace of Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676). In 1668, he went to Deventer where he published the SET in 1671. In 1674, he returned to Heusden and obtained his emeritus in 1693. He died around 1700.

Rijssen was a learned and prolific writer. Most of his writings were polemic in nature. We provide here a list of some his writings. They were originally written in Latin or Dutch, but we have translated the titles into English.¹⁵² This list does not include the *SET* or the *Compendium of Turretin*, which we shall discuss below.

1. *Inaugural Theological Disputation* (1660).
2. *A Dissertation on Predestination* (1660).
3. *The truth in accordance with godliness of William Ames solidly defended in his view of playing dice in Book 2 of the Medulla, chapter 2* (Utrecht, 1660).
4. *A Synopsis of the Impure Theology of the Arminians* (Utrecht, 1661).
5. *A Discussion of the Justification of the Fathers and Remission of Sins in the Old Testament* (Utrecht, 1666).

¹⁵¹ We can determine this from his first publication which is a *disputatio inauguralis*, indicating that it was his doctoral defense of theological theses. To get an understanding of how this took place, see Nauta, *Maresius*, 88-92.

¹⁵² This is a list of only some of Rijssen's works.

6. *The Judgment of Some Theologians of Deventer over the Book by Louis Wolzogen on the Interpretation of Holy Scripture* (Middelburg, 1669).
7. *The Old Orthodox Truth Obscured and Hidden by Descartes, Cocceius, Wittich, Burman, Wolzogen, Perizon, Groenewegen, Allinga, etc. Now Cleard Up and Discovered* (Middelburg, 1674).
8. *Dead stop (doot-stuypen) of the Cartesians and Cocceians* (Willem Clerck: Utrecht, 1676).
9. *A Torch Lit for an Erring Conscience* (Willem Clerck: Utrecht, 1678).
10. *The Just Detesting of the Most Wicked Book by Adrian Beverland on Original Sin* (1680).¹⁵³

The *SET* was printed at least three times.¹⁵⁴ The first edition seems to have been printed in Deventer in the Netherlands in 1671. This is the date of the dedication to the rulers of Deventer found in the Edinburgh edition. The second printing was in 1676 in Bern, Switzerland. It was printed for the third time in Edinburgh in 1692. The *SET* consists of eighteen chapters covering all of the theological topics. Each chapter has numbered paragraphs explaining the orthodox teaching on the doctrine and under various paragraphs there are

¹⁵³ The lack of writings in the 1680s is perhaps due to his preparation of the abridgement of Turretin. The first edition was published in 1690.

¹⁵⁴ I have been unable to find any other editions.

controversies that include a statement of the question, the opponent, the arguments for the orthodox position, and then a refutation of objections.

The *SET* should not be confused with another work that Rijssen put together, *The Compendium of the Didactic and Elenctic Theology of Francis Turretin* (hereafter *CT*) published in 1695 in Amsterdam. This work under the same title was printed with the same title in 1703 in Franeker and in 1731 in Utrecht. The same book was also published under the title *Summary of Didactic and Elenctic Theology from our*¹⁵⁵ *most famous writers, especially Francis Turretin* in 1690 and 1703 in Bern and in 1731 in Frankfurt.¹⁵⁶

The *CT* can best be described as Turretin's *Institutes* abridged into a Rijssen framework. In Turretin's *Institutes* there are twenty topics. In Rijssen's *CT*, there are eighteen topics that are exactly the same as those in the *SET*. Most of the questions in the *CT* are the same as in the *SET*, and Rijssen even added many of the controversies that are in the *SET* but not in the *Institutes*. In the *CT*, it is not often clear which words are Rijssen's and which words are Turretin's. However, a simple guide is that most of the brief statements are from Rijssen, and most of the longer

¹⁵⁵ "Our," that is, *the Reformed Church's* most famous theologians.

¹⁵⁶ I have only been able to look at copies with the first title. I assume that they are the same work because the 1690 Bern edition has 831 pages, and the 1703 Franeker edition has the same amount. The 1703 Bern edition is in two volumes, as is the 1731 Frankfurt edition. The 1731 Utrecht edition has 682 pages, but the 1695 Amsterdam edition has only 290 pages. Rijssen, *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* has 363 pages, but they are only 5 ½ by 3 ½ inches.

statements are from Turretin. The consequence is that around ninety percent of the work consists of quotations from Turretin.

There has been much confusion in the secondary literature on this point.¹⁵⁷ Most of them seem to be unaware of the shorter work. J.H. Scholten in *De Leer Der Hervormde Kerk* correctly notes that the *CT* is a work of Turretin,¹⁵⁸ but then he lists the other four editions under Rijssen.¹⁵⁹ Albert Schweizer in *Die Glaubenslehre* regularly quotes Turretin from the *CT* but says that he is referring to Rijssen. Heinrich Heppe's *Reformed Dogmatics* provides many examples of this error. One would get the impression from reading it that he cites Rijssen far more than Turretin because he gives very few quotations from Turretin's *Institutes*. However, most of the citations from Rijssen are actually citations of Turretin but are taken from the *CT*. For example, he cites Rijssen on pages 577-578 of *Reformed Dogmatics* (XXI.21) in two lengthy quotations. The first quotation is an exact quote from Rijssen's *SET*.¹⁶⁰ The second quotation is from Turretin and consists of a string of

¹⁵⁷ I do not mean to be judgmental here. It is extremely confusing, and I have had the use of the internet to search multiple libraries. If someone picked up the *CT* or one of its editions, one could easily think that this is the work of Rijssen. Furthermore, the text never says whether the words belong to Turretin or Rijssen.

¹⁵⁸ Scholten, I:70.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, I:73. He also lists an additional edition in 1649, but this is either a typo or a mistake on his part.

¹⁶⁰ See Rijssen, *Summa Theologiae Elencticae*, pp. 224-225. In the *Compendium*, it is on pp. 145-146.

quotations from the *Institutes*, XVI.xix,¹⁶¹ and so it is important to recognize that the *CT* and the *SET* are two distinct works and that within the *CT* some words are Rijssen's but most are Turretin's.

Conclusion – The *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* in its Seventeenth Century Context and Use for the Twenty-First Century

The Context

In light of the foregoing introduction, one can easily discern that the *SET* both reflects the seventeenth century theological context and provides a window into it. First, in its *theological* character it is Reformed orthodoxy. A work of such brevity indicates a consensus on these issues as a summary of what is believed by the Reformed orthodox. At the same time, there is evidence of the diversity within that consensus, but even in such cases, Rijssen gives his opinion on that diversity in the context of a discussion that would have been well-known to his readers. Moreover, the *SET* illustrates the continuing reflection that occurred on the original insights of the reformers seeking to sharpen and clarify them with a view to development but not revision or abandonment of those original doctrines.

Second, in its *elenctic* character, one can observe the great struggle of the seventeenth century. The high-powered theology of Rome, the Socinians, and the Arminians, forced the Reformed to defend with clarity and precision the doctrines that they held dear. Rijssen's purpose in

¹⁶¹ The quote in the *Compendium* is on page 158.

writing this work was particularly to prepare students to have a manual on how to defend the Reformed faith. This was not superfluous, especially in the tolerant Dutch society where many proponents of views contrary to the Reformed Church continued to labor and exist in various ways.

Third, in its *summa* character, the institutionalization of the Reformation doctrine is evident. In the subtitle of this work, Rijssen specifically mentions that the purpose is to “aid the memory of young students.” In the academies and universities, it was necessary to have learning tools. Rijssen sought to provide just such a tool. This was necessary because the youth of many nations were at that time being educated in universities and academies that taught Reformed theology, and theology continued to be one of the most important aspects of the curriculum.¹⁶² The “scholasticism” present in the *SET* is a reflection of its context: the *schola*. In those days as now, precision and clarity are necessary for inculcating teachings and methods to students. And this is the intention he had for the *SET*.

Use for Today

What use can Rijssen’s *SET* be for today? First, if it remains in Latin, it will be of little use to an institutional or self-educated student of theology or the history of theology. Latin is no longer the *lingua franca* of

¹⁶² See Nauta, *Maresius*, 156-165. He describes Maresius’ teaching in the Latin school of ’s Hertogenbosch.

the academic world. Even though the various national languages are all used in academic work, English is rapidly becoming the *lingua franca* of the academic world. Consequently, there is good reason to translate these old Latin works into English, not only for use in English speaking countries but also for students in other countries who use English as an academic language. And even where it is not, English is extremely common as a second language. Thus, a translation of not only this work but the huge corpus of sixteenth and seventeenth century works into English is very useful for scholars and students now.

This book is helpful for the study of the history of Reformed theology and theology in general. It provides an example of the formulation of seventeenth century Reformed orthodox theology, but, in addition, its elenctic sections provide an introduction to the issues between the Reformed and their opponents in the seventeenth century and beyond. Moreover, it is illustrative of the scholastic method in theological education in general. This need is particularly acute because, there appear to be no scholastic summaries of Reformed theology from the second half of the seventeenth century or the first half of the 18th century available in English. There are popular summaries available.¹⁶³

¹⁶³ Such as Thomas Watson, *Body of Divinity* (repr., Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth, 2000).

There are some larger works now available.¹⁶⁴ There are also scholastic summaries available in English from the early part of the seventeenth century, but there are none from the productive period following the synod of Dort to the end of late orthodoxy.¹⁶⁵

Second, this volume can serve as a helpful companion to Francis Turretin's *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. This work has now been reprinted and is readily available in English. Rijssen's *SET* closely parallels Turretin's larger work and offers a helpful summary of many of the main lines of Turretin's argumentation. This is particularly helpful because Turretin's *Institutes* have been extremely influential in Reformed theology down to the present day.¹⁶⁶

Finally, there are still many who basically hold to the same faith outlined in the *SET*. For those who hold to this theology, this book still provides a helpful manual of the basic positions of the Reformed faith, the Scripture verses that support these doctrines as well as the opponents that this doctrine faces today. Rijssen intended his work to

¹⁶⁴ Such as Turretin, *Institutes* and Herman Witsius, *Economy of the Covenants between God and Man: Comprehending a Complete Body of Divinity*, trans. William Crookshank (London: R. Bynes, 1822; repr. Den Dulk Foundation, 1990).

¹⁶⁵ Such as Johannes Wollebius, *Compendium of Christian Theology* in John W. Beardslee, *Reformed Dogmatics: J. Wollebius, G. Voetius, and F. Turretin* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965). See also William Ames, *The Marrow of Theology*, translated with an introduction by John D. Eusden (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997). Note that these were already translated into English in the early seventeenth century. Conversely, whereas many of the continental Reformed works into English prior to 1650, there are not as many translated into English after 1650. Perhaps this is another reason why there have been few modern translations.

¹⁶⁶ See Mark Beach, *Christ and the Covenant*, 69-76; Gerrit Kizer, *François Turretini*, 259-264.

be used by students, Pastors, and educated laymen to aid them in understanding and defending their faith in a clear way. This work can still be useful toward that end today.

Notes on the Translation & Annotations

In this translation, I have tried to maintain as precise and literal a translation as possible. This is very important because many of the words employed have a technical meaning that is not necessarily conveyed by one word in our language. For example, the word *realis* does not mean “real” as opposed to imaginary or non-existent. Rather, it denotes a substantive or “thingish”¹⁶⁷ distinction or manner of existence. It can be opposed to a virtual or moral distinction, which is “real” but not substantive. Consequently, it is important to read this document in the light of other seventeenth century Reformed documents.¹⁶⁸ I have often put the Latin in parentheses to alert readers when this occurs.

On the other side, I have often tried to give a smoother reading where the meaning would be unaffected. For example, in the phrase “*si per articulos fundamentals intellegantur articuli necessarii ad salutem*,” I have translated it with the active, “if we understand by fundamental

¹⁶⁷ I have taken this point from Richard Muller via my professor Dr. Mark Beach.

¹⁶⁸ See Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: drawn principally from Protestant scholastic theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985). Another helpful work in understanding these distinctions is Johannes Maccovius, *Opuscula Philsophica Omnia* (Amsterdam: Louis and Daniel Elzever, 1660). He discusses logic and metaphysics in relation to theology. This book is now available for free download from Gallica.

articles those articles that are necessary for salvation...”¹⁶⁹ The Latin of Rijssen is often very clipped in keeping with the summary character of the work. A good example of this is the objection to his thesis that knowledge of God is inscribed on the soul of man. The objection is “*fide haberi debet* (Heb. 11:6).” This could be translated, “[It] ought be obtained or be had by faith.” I have supplied objects and subjects to make it easier and then put it in the active voice, “They ought to obtain this knowledge by faith.”¹⁷⁰ The same meaning is retained, but it is a smoother read in English.

Rijssen’s *SET* was intended as a very brief but complete summary of elenctic theology. For this reason, he has very few citations in his work. I have added annotations for two reasons. First, many of the issues debated are not as familiar to readers today as they would have been in Rijssen’s day. I have taken these citations primarily from Rijssen’s *Compendium of Turretin*. In that work, Rijssen follows the same format as in the *SET*, but he often adds brief notes providing an explanation of the reason for the question at hand. I have taken portions from the CT as best expressing the mind of Rijssen himself as to the meaning and importance of the question, even though most of these are actually quotes from Turretin himself, as noted above. Second, I have tried to explain unfamiliar terms, questions about Scripture citations, or

¹⁶⁹ Below, p. 7.

¹⁷⁰ Below, p. 2.

obscure argumentation. In a few places, I have given my own explanation, but I have tried most often to give an explanation from other seventeenth century Reformed writers or modern experts in the field. In all of these annotations, I have aimed at helping the educated laymen, Pastor, and seminary student make use of this work without having to make extensive recourse to other works at the same time. On the other side, I have tried to limit these quotations so as not to infringe upon the character of the book as a *summa*.

Chapter 1

Theology

§I. *As a disposition (habitualiter)*,¹ theology is a science (*scientia*). *As a system (systematicè)*, it is the doctrine of divine truth that leads to godliness and salvation of men (Tit. 1:1; 2 Tim. 1:13).

§II. We reject the division of theology into *Archetypal*, *ectypal*, etc.²

1. Because natural science, mathematics, jurisprudence, indeed every art and science could be divided in that way.
2. Because our theology is not formed (*expressa*) according to that knowledge that God has of Himself but according to God's revelation.
3. Christ, the angels, and the blessed in heaven know many things through revelation.

§III. But theology teaches these three things:

1. What is to be known (*sentendum*) concerning God (Jn. 17:3), [or, what one is to think about or concerning God]
2. How He is to be worshipped (Mc. 6:8),
3. And what is to be expected from Him (Heb. 11:6).

¹ "True theology can be considered either systematically, by the manner that any discipline is set forth in its own precepts by a particular method, or as a disposition (*habitualiter*) by the manner of any particular disposition residing in the mind," Samuel Maresius, *Collegium Theologicum* [Groningen: Johannes Collenus, 1659], I:8. For a discussion of "dispositions of the mind," see Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics, vol. 1: Prolegomena to Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003), 355-360.

² "[Archetypal] is that knowledge that God has of Himself. [Ectypal] is the knowledge of creatures concerning God and divine things," Turretin, *Compendium*, 1. Rijssen does not deny this distinction altogether but simply its use for understanding theology. He is following in the line of Lucas Trelcatius, Sr., an earlier Dutch theologian (1542-1602) wrote, "We understand by theology not that archetypal knowledge which is in God of God Himself, and even is God Himself...but ectypal from that prior knowledge expressed and formed by revelation and gracious communication," *Scholastica & Methodica Locorum Communium Sacrae Theologiae Institutio* (London: John Bill, 1604), 1. See Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:233-238.

§IV. These three things are made known by *nature* and by God's *revelation*, and for that reason theology is said to be either *natural* or *supernatural*.

§V. Natural theology is either *innate* (*ingenita*), by which man's conscience is convinced from its own nature that God exists and is to be worshipped (Rom. 1:19); or *acquired*, which is that which someone acquires:

1. By a consideration of facts.
2. By reasoning.
3. By instruction (Rom. 1:20; 2:14-15).

Controversy 1 – *Has it been written by nature in the souls of men that God exists, governs the world, and ought to be worshipped by them? We affirm against the Socinians.*³

Arguments

1. God has revealed Himself and His holiness to all (Rom. 1:19, 32; Jn. 1:9).
2. Nature teaches what is honorable and what is shameful (1 Cor. 11:14).
3. Conscience convicts men when they have done good or evil (Rom. 2:14-15).

Objections

1. *The ungodly say that God does not exist (Ps. 14:1).* Reply. They try to persuade themselves that He does not.
2. *They ought to obtain this knowledge by faith (Heb. 11:6).* Reply. This should be considered the foundation (*principium*) of natural and supernatural theology.
3. *They are Gentiles who do not know God.* Reply. They do not know the true God, but their consciences dictate that some divine being exists.

Controversy 2 – *Can someone know solely from the structure of this world that there is some God who governs the affairs of this world and ought to be worshipped, if they apply their mind to it? We affirm against the Socinians.*

³ See Johann Friedrich Stapfer, *Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae* (Zurich: Heidegger and Associates, 1758), XII.7-19.

Arguments

1. God gives them testimonies of Himself (Acts 14:17, 17:26).
2. Creatures proclaim the Creator (Ps. 19:1-2; Rom. 1:20; Job 12:8-10).
3. Whoever considers the creatures carefully perceives the incomparable wisdom and power of God in them (Ps. 8:1, 3; Is. 40:26).
4. Those who are not moved by them to worship God are rebuked (Rom. 1:21, 1 Cor. 1:21).

Objection

1. *Outstanding philosophers deny that the world is from God and governed by Him.* Reply. “They became foolish in their thinking” (Rom. 1:21). Just as men today deny many things which they are in a position to know to be otherwise.

§VI. Theology is said to be natural:

1. Because it is from nature.
2. Because it remains with nature.
3. Because it only teaches natural things.

§VII. And it teaches:

1. That God exists.
2. That He is to be worshipped.
3. That we are to live honestly.
4. That the soul is immortal.
5. That virtue deserves reward.
6. That wickedness deserves punishment.

Controversy – Does philosophy contradict theology? In other words, can the same opinion be true in philosophy and false in theology while the laws of non-contradiction⁴ are maintained? We deny against the Lutherans.⁵

⁴ Latin: “regulis oppositionis.” We normally refer to this as the law of non-contradiction. On *oppositio*, see Johannes Maccovius, *Opuscula Philosophica Omnia* (Amsterdam: Louis and Daniel Elzevier, 1660), 21-22 and 27-28.

⁵ “Concerning the use of philosophy in theology, there are those who sin by excess and those who sin by defect. Those who sin in excess are those who confound philosophy and theology...[such as] the scholastics who rest more on the reasoning of philosophers than on the testimony of Scripture. The Socinians stumble on the same rock when they make philosophy the principle of faith and of the interpretation of Scripture. Those who sin in defect think that philosophy and theology are contrary and therefore completely eliminate it from theology. In previous centuries, the fanatics and

Arguments

1. True philosophy is light (Jn. 1:9) which does not contend with light.
2. We ought to embrace all that is true (Phil. 4:8), but we ought not to do that if one truth could oppose another.
3. Contradictory things cannot be true at the same time.
4. Christ and the Apostles argued from the principles of philosophy (Lk. 24:39; Acts 17:24-25; 1 Cor. 11:14).

Objections

1. *“Beware that no one seduces you by philosophy” (Col. 2:8).* He refers to false philosophy not true philosophy. He is thinking of the evil teachings and the crafty arts of philosophers.
2. *Philosophy contradicts floating iron, the virgin birth, etc.* Reply. On the contrary, philosophy says that these things cannot happen through nature, but it does not deny that God can do them.

§VIII. There are five things to which philosophy cannot attain:

1. The Trinity.
2. The corruption of humanity in Adam.
3. Christ the Mediator.
4. True blessedness.
5. The means by which true blessedness can be obtained.

Controversy – *Is natural theology sufficient to lead anyone to salvation, and can anyone be saved without the knowledge of Christ and the Gospel?* We deny against the Pelagians, Arminians, and Socinians.⁶

enthusiasts held this view, and today the Anabaptists and Weigelians do,” Francis Turretin, *Compendium Theologiae Didactico-Elencticae ex Theologorum Nostrorum Institutionibus Theologicis auctum et illustratum*, ed. Leonard Rijssen [Amsterdam: George Gallet, 1695], 2. Rijssen does not list the Lutherans as the opponents in the *Compendium Theologiae*.

⁶ “The impious dogma of the Pelagians provides the occasion of the question. Not only the Libertines, David Forzistae, and others hold that ‘everyone can be saved in their own religion’ by maintaining an honest way of life, but also the Socinians, who reduce the points of religion to a very few common to all. The Arminians hold that by the right use of the light of nature they can acquire the light of grace and by that grace come to glory. The Papists also are very bold to contend for the salvation of the Gentiles (*Ethnicorum*) without Christ,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 3.

Arguments

1. No one can be saved except through Christ and faith in Him (Jn. 8:24; 15:6; Acts 4:12; 1 Cor. 3:11; Gal. 3:9, 16, 22).
2. Anyone who does not know or have Christ does not have life and is without hope of salvation (1 Jn. 5:12, Eph. 2:12).
3. The law cannot bless man, much less nature (Acts 13:39, Rom. 3:20, 8:3, Gal. 3:10).

Objections

1. *In that case, how would they be without excuse (Rom. 2:1)?* Reply. Because they do those things that they know are worthy of death (Rom. 1:32). *Further objection. The goodness of God leads to conversion (v. 4).* Reply. This ought to have been a moving cause unto conversion; however, it is not such without faith in Christ. *Further objection. The doers of the law will be justified (v. 7, 13).* Reply. This means: if someone would be saved by the law, he should not only be a hearer of the law but a doer of it.
2. *They were able to find God by reaching out for Him (Acts 17:27).* Reply. This means that they can find out that God is, but they were not able to come to salvation without conversion and faith in Christ.
3. *Gentiles were converted (Jonah 3:10).* Reply. 1. The Word of God had been preached to them. 2. "To be converted" in this verse means to depart from the wicked deeds they had been doing.

§IX. It was necessary for another theology to be revealed:

1. On account of the innate (*ingeni*) blindness of human nature (Lk. 10:22, 1 Cor. 1:21).
2. On account of the exalted character of the things revealed (Eph. 1:9).
3. On account of the deceits of wicked men and Satan (Eph. 4:11, 14).

§X. The use of human reason in theology is:

1. To understand the things revealed (Mt. 13:51).
2. To compare it with other things (Acts 17:11).
3. To explain (Neh. 8:9).
4. To discern what is false (Phil. 1:10).
5. To vindicate it from objections (Rom. 9:19-20).

Controversy 1 – Can human reason, taken subjectively, or the natural faculty of understanding, be the principle or norm by which all religious

*controversies, including those things that have been revealed in Scripture, should be examined and resolved? We deny against the Socinians.*⁷

Arguments

1. Human reason can err and be mistaken (Rom. 3:4).
2. Human reason is corrupt, blind, and perverse (Rom. 8:7, 1 Cor. 2:14).
3. It only has human authority (Jn. 5:9, 34).
4. It ought to be subjected to Scripture (2 Cor. 10:5).

Objections

1. *Reason is the only instrument of understanding and judging* (Mt. 13:19, 23). Reply. It is an instrument of judging, not the norm of those things which are propounded in the Scripture.
2. *What is true in theology cannot be false in philosophy.* Reply. But it often seems false to corrupt reason, and theology is above natural reason.
3. *Our worship is rational* (Rom. 12:1). Reply. That is, duty and truth agree (1 Pet. 1:22).

Controversy 2 – *Is natural reason taken objectively, or philosophy itself, a norm by which everything that has been revealed in Scripture ought to be examined? We deny against the same.*

Arguments

1. Philosophy is only an idea of nature, but theology is above nature.
2. The Word of God is the highest (*prima*) truth, which does not have a superior norm (Jn. 17:17).
3. All things must be examined by the standard⁸ of Scripture (Is. 8:20, Acts 17:11).
4. The Scriptures are to be believed absolutely in all things (Acts 24:14, 1 Jn. 5:10).

⁷ “We allow [to reason] the relationship of *an instrument by which* or *means through which* we can be led to faith. However, it is not the *principle by which* the teachings of faith are proved or the foundation on which they are built or grounded,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 4.

⁸ The original has “*tanquam ad lapidem lydium*,” “as to a touchstone.”

Objections

1. *What philosophy contradicts cannot be true.* Reply. No, also what Scripture contradicts. 2. However, certain things can be true which do not destroy the essence of something but yet do oppose the common rules of philosophy, such as an axe floating and a virgin giving birth.⁹
2. *Philosophy ought to teach what is consonant with the truth and what is not consonant.* Reply. That which in nature is such, but not what is in Scripture.

§XI. This is what one should think about fundamental articles: If by fundamental articles we understand articles necessary for salvation, then all are necessary by a necessity of *precept and means* (Phil. 4:8). But if we understand those articles that are basic and fundamental to the rest of the articles, then those concerning Scripture, Christ, and the Trinity deserve to be called fundamental articles (Eph. 2:20, 1 Cor. 3:10-11). I do not think for one moment that one should engage in disputes concerning them because the articles that are built upon those foundations are no less necessary than the foundations themselves.

⁹ In other words, iron still remains iron even if it floats by a supernatural power. In contrast, for a human to be in more than one place at the same time, as some Lutherans assert concerning Christ's human nature, destroys the "essence of the thing" and therefore cannot be true.

Chapter 2

Holy Scripture

§I. The principle of existence (*principium essendi*) or cause of theology is God Himself (Eph. 1:9). The principle of knowing (*principium cognoscendi*) is the Word of God (Heb. 11:3, 1 Jn. 2:14).

§II. “Word” denotes:

1. A spoken word (Heb. 13:7).
2. A written word (Rom. 3:2).
3. A word received in the soul (1 Jn. 2:14).
4. Christ Himself (Rev. 19:13).

§III. The spoken word and the written word do not differ in author or dignity but only in the way they are set forth. It was first spoken. Afterwards, it was written (Heb. 1:1).

§IV. It was necessary for the Word of God to be written:

1. So that anyone could read it (Heb. 11:2),
2. And by reading it confirm his faith (Jn. 20:31).
3. So that it might not be destroyed by forgetfulness (Ps. 102:18),
4. Or be able to be corrupted by evil men (1 Pet. 2:2).
5. So that the New might be confirmed by the Old (Rom. 3:21).

§V. Scripture is a collection of books written down by men of God through the Holy Spirit concerning the things men need to know, believe, and do for the glory of God and their own salvation.

Controversy – *Is the Christian Bible the Word of God?* We affirm against the Atheists.

Arguments

1. Because it alone teaches the truest and holiest way to eternal happiness in Christ the Mediator by justification, sanctification, and faith.
2. Because it teaches such things which no man could ascertain: the nature and persons of God; creation of the world, angels, and men;

- the fall of mankind and the demons; the promise and birth of the Mediator from a Virgin; the flood; etc.
3. It predicted innumerable future things in every time which both have been fulfilled and are being fulfilled (Is. 41:21, 46:10), such as the four monarchies, the reign of Christ and of Antichrist, the end of the world, the judgment of God, etc.
 4. It teaches all these things in continuous harmony so that nothing false or wicked may be found in it.
 5. The divine efficacy that converted whole kingdoms and turned them from the world and its pleasures to the strictest piety.

Objections

1. *There seem to be contradictions in it.* Reply. To the inexperienced there seem to be, but it does not seem so to others.
2. *Certain books have not been received by many.* Reply. This was their error.
3. *Various manuscripts read something in one and another in another.* Reply. There are a few variations in a few places, but the rest harmonize.

§VI. The necessity of Holy Scripture is this: it ought to be read, preached, received, retained, and observed (Rev. 1:3).

Controversy 1 – *Does the Church today need the Holy Scripture to worship and know God rightly?* We affirm against the Papists.¹

Arguments

1. It is a means of conversion (James 1:18), faith (Rom. 10:17), godliness (Eph. 4:12), and consolation (Rom. 15:4).
2. It is the foundation of the Church and all its worship (Eph. 2:20).
3. It is the standard by which all things are to be examined (Is. 8:20, Gal. 1:9).
4. Everyone is commanded to retain it faithfully (Col. 3:16, Rev. 1:3).
5. It is a light in the darkness (2 Pet. 1:19) and a corrector of errors (Mt. 22:29), but all these things are necessary.

¹ “The Papists say that Scripture has a certain use for the Church but not a necessary one so that they might establish their traditions. We say that it is necessary not absolutely because God built His Church for 2000 years before Moses by a living voice alone. But we say that it is hypothetically necessary on account of the divine will,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 7.

Objections

1. *From Adam to Moses, the Church was without the Scripture.* Reply. This is not proven (Jude 14). Second, they had regular extraordinary revelations (Heb. 1:1).
2. *From Moses to Christ, the Churches among the Gentiles such as Job and his friends lacked the Scripture.* Reply. None of these things can be proved (see Acts 8:30).
3. *If Scripture were necessary, the Apostles would have been given a command to write them.* Reply. First, there is a general command (Mt. 28:19). Second, there is a special command (Rev. 1-2). Third, in the place of a command there was an instigation of the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21).
4. *It is sufficient, if it is preached orally.* Reply. Then it is necessary. Second, as he who preaches ought to know the Scripture, so it is with the one who hears (Acts 17:11).

Controversy 2 – *Is Holy Scripture only necessary for children and beginners and should those who are more mature (perfectiores) follow only the Spirit?* We deny against the Enthusiasts and Libertines.²

Arguments

1. It has been prescribed to all without distinction (Col. 3:16, Rom. 1:6, 8).
2. It has also been written to adults, those who are trained, and the mature (1 Cor. 10:15; 1 Jn. 2:13-14; Phil. 3:15; Ps. 119:18).
3. No one should ever let them go (Dt. 6:6; Prov. 3:1, 3).

Objections

1. *You do not need anyone to teach you (1 Jn. 2:27).* Reply. You do not need anyone to teach you another doctrine than the one received from the Word of God, but they ought to have remained in it.

² “[The Enthusiasts] say that all in the true Church have such understanding of the mysteries of godliness, and that by immediate inspiration and revelation, as there is no need of ministry. On this ground they cry out against schools...,” Edward Leigh, *Body of Divinity* [London, 1662], 503. “The founders of this sect of the Libertines were Coppinus and Quintius, both Flemmings and both Papists...They abused the Scripture itself against the Scripture, pretending that sentence of Paul (2 Cor. 3:6) as if Paul by the letter understood the Scripture, but by the Spirit, internal revelations out of the Scripture...,” Ibid., 506. See Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Socinianismi Confutati Compendium* (Lugdunum Batavia: Felice Lopez, 1690), 401-440.

2. *The letter kills (2 Cor. 3:6).* Reply. The letter is the law that condemns the sinner, and the law is also necessary for that to happen.

§VII. The books of Holy Scripture are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, etc.

Controversy – *Are the Apocryphal books part of Holy Scripture, and do they have divine authority for establishing and confirming articles of faith?* We deny against the Papists and the Anabaptists.³

Arguments

1. All the oracles of the O.T. were committed to the Jews (Rom. 3:2), but these books were not, inasmuch as they were not written by prophets or in the Hebrew language.
2. Moses and the prophets constitute the whole Scripture (Lk. 24:27, Acts 24:14).
3. They contain many false, ungodly, and absurd statements.⁴

Objections

1. *They were sometimes read in the Church.* Reply. As human writings.
2. *They have been received into the canon by the Church.* Reply. By the Roman Church in error.

§VIII. The principal attributes of Scripture are authority, perfection, and perspicuity.

§IX. Authority is Scripture's divine eminence that obligates man to faith and obedience (1 Thess. 2:13, 1 Tim. 4:9).

Controversy – *Does Holy Scripture have its authority, or power to command (obligandi), from the Church? In other words, should the Scripture be received as canon because the Roman church commands it, so*

³ On the Anabaptist view of the Apocrypha, see Henry Elias Docker, *The Dutch Anabaptists* (Chicago: Judson Press, 1921), 152-154.

⁴ Our author notes, "See the Belgic (or Dutch) preface to them," that is, the preface to the Dutch translation, the *States Bible (Staten Bijbel)*. See the examples in Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, trans. George Musgrave Giger, ed. James T. Dennison (Philipsburg: P&R, 1994), II.ix.5-6.

*that it should not and cannot be received as canon unless the Church commands it? We deny against the Papists.*⁵

Arguments

1. The authority of God speaking in the Scripture is greater than all human authority; therefore, men can give no authority to it (1 Jn. 5:9; Jn. 5:34, 36, 39; 1 Thess. 2:13).
2. Holy Scripture gives the Church all its authority; therefore, it receives none (Eph. 2:20, 1 Pet. 5:11, Mt. 28:20).
3. Holy Scripture teaches and prescribes the way of salvation without anyone's witness (2 Tim. 3:15, 2 Pet. 1:19); therefore, it is necessary that we hear it, or we must perish (1 Jn. 5:10).
4. The Word of God was received by men and ought to have been received by men before the testimony of any Church (Is. 1:2, 10; Jer. 2:4; Lk. 1:20; Heb. 2:2; 1 Thess. 2:13).

Objections

1. *The Church is the pillar of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15).* Reply. Not establishing the truth but established by the truth. It is a genitive of effect like house of God (Heb. 3:6).⁶
2. *I would not have believed the Gospel unless the authority of the Church had moved me.* Reply. Men can be leaders (*homines duces*) and moving causes⁷ by which we are led to the reading of Scripture, but they cannot give it any authority (Jn. 5:39, 42).
3. *The Church points out which books are canonical and which are not.* Reply. Just as John the Baptist pointed out who the Messiah was and who was not.
4. *The testimony of the Church is the most certain, the greatest, and the most ancient.* Reply. The Roman Church has none of these

⁵ "This is the way that Papists form the question today. In the previous century they spoke differently when they thought that the Scripture without the testimony of the Church was no more worthy of faith than the Quran, Livy, and Aesop's fables. But now they speak more cautiously and say that the Scriptures are indeed authentically divine in themselves and absolute, but relatively and in relation to us (*quoad nos*) their authority depends on the Church," Turretin, *Compendium*, 8.

⁶ That is, as God built and established the house, so the truth builds up and establishes the pillar.

⁷ "It was the external motivation to faith but not the infallible principle to be believed," Turretin, *Compendium*, 9.

attributes, and the testimony of God is much greater and much more certain.⁸

§X. In Holy Scripture, certain things are:

1. Narrated historically which consequently ought to be believed to have taken place, as in Matt. 1-2.
2. Taught and praised which we ought to be received as in Matt. 3:17.
3. Condemned which ought to be avoided as in 1 Cor. 10:11.

Therefore, it is said to be historically and normatively authoritative (authentica).

§XI. The perfection of Holy Scripture is its divine eminence by which it contains all things which are necessary to us for our salvation (2 Tim. 3:16).

Controversy 1 – Does Holy Scripture contain all things that are necessary for someone to know, believe, and do for salvation? We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. It is said to be perfect (Ps. 19:7).
2. It sets forth the whole counsel of God necessary for our salvation (Acts 20:27, Col. 1:26).
3. It perfectly instructs man for every good work (2 Tim. 3:16).
4. It is a rule of faith (Gal. 6:16, Phil. 2:16).
5. Salvation can be obtained from it (Jn. 5:29, 20:31, Lk. 16:29).
6. In a matter of religion, we must not think beyond it (1 Cor. 4:6).

Controversy 2 - Are there, then, unwritten traditions that contain doctrines necessary to salvation? We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. God prohibited anything to be added to or taken from His Word (Dt. 4:2, 12:32; Gal. 1:8; Rev. 22:18).
2. Scripture is a holy testament (2 Cor. 3:14), but traditions must not be added to a testament (Gal. 3:15).
3. God condemns doctrines that are not contained in Holy Scripture (Mt. 15:9, Col. 2:20, 1 Pet. 1:18).
4. Traditions are uncertain, false, and the weapons of impostors (2 Thess. 2:2).

⁸ “The Church is more ancient, formally, as to its mode of writing but not materially as to the substance of the teaching,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 9.

Objections

1. *Hold to the traditions (2 Thess. 2:15)*. Reply. Traditions are the spoken and written doctrines.
2. *“You cannot bear some things now” (Jn. 16:12)*. Reply. But these things had been written before in the O.T. and were written afterwards in the N.T.
3. *The Apostles taught much more than they wrote*. Reply. Not in relation to the substance of their teachings.
4. *The meaning (sensus) of Scripture comes through tradition*. Reply. No. It is in Scripture itself.
5. *Becanus enumerated many things which the Scripture does not have*.⁹ Reply. The Scripture either does have them, or they are not necessary for salvation.

§XII. Scripture contains some things in express words and some by legitimate consequences.

Controversy – *Can there be an article of faith that is not contained in Scripture in exact words but is drawn from it by consequence?* We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.¹⁰

Arguments

1. Our Savior Himself and the Apostles proved articles of faith in this way such as the Divinity of Christ (Mt. 22:44-45), the resurrection of the dead (Mt. 22:31-32), the death of the Messiah and His resurrection after three days (Lk. 24:45-46, 1 Cor. 15:4), justification by faith without works (Rom. 3:28, 4:3), and the truth of the whole religion (Acts 17:2-3), and Paul does nothing but that in the whole letter to the Hebrews.
2. Scripture is given for this purpose (Jn. 5:39, 2 Tim. 3:16, Rom. 15:4).

Objections

1. *The simple do not grasp these things*. Reply. Let them study, and they will grasp them as in Acts 17:11.

⁹ Martin Becanus, *Manuale Controversarium*, I.ii.15-29.

¹⁰ “The Papists want to compel us to demonstrate that all our dogmas are contained in the express words of Scripture that they more easily free themselves from our arguments.” Turretin, *Compendium*, 10.

2. *Holy Scripture is clear and perfect.* Reply. This is clearly and perfectly contained in any principle that is legitimately deduced (*eruitur*) from it.
3. *Our reason can be mistaken in its conclusions.* Reply. But it is not mistaken when it legitimately deduces a doctrine from Scripture.

§XIII. The perspicuity of Holy Scripture is its divine eminence whereby it describes the mysteries of salvation in such a way that the true mean can be gathered from the words.

§XIV. Three things can be said to be clear and perspicuous:

1. An ability in man when he easily ascertains things (Eph. 1:19);
2. The thing explained, such as two and two are four. The mysteries are not clear in this way (2 Pet. 3:16);
3. The way of explaining (Neh. 8:9), which is what we are properly referring to on this point.

*Controversy – Are those things which are necessary for salvation set forth in every place in Holy Scripture so obscurely that he who seriously examines the meaning of the words cannot ascertain them but is forced to seek the meaning from the Roman Church? We deny against the Papists.*¹¹

Arguments

1. Holy Scripture is expressly said to be lucid, clear, and even light itself (Ps. 19:7-8, 119:105; 2 Cor. 4:4; 2 Pet. 1:19).
2. Holy Scripture is useful for teaching; therefore, its contents must be set out in such a way that it can be understood (Rom. 15:4, 2 Tim. 3:16).
3. It was written to common people and children and was understood by them (Dt. 1:1, Rom. 2:18, 20, 10:6, 9; 1 Jn. 2:12; 2 Tim. 3:15).
4. If the Scripture was so obscure, then no one could be rebuked for not understanding it or warned to grasp (*capiat*) it, but they are (Lk. 24:25, 2 Tim. 2:7).
5. If the Scripture was so obscure, then not even the Church could bring out its sense.

¹¹ “Becanus divides the Scripture into histories, prophecies, mysteries, and morals. The first and last do not have great obscurity on the part of the things themselves, but the prophecies and mysteries do. The mysteries include ‘the Trinity, the incarnation, predestination, justifying faith, the presence of Christ in the Supper, and similar things,’” Turretin, *Compendium*, 15.

Objections

1. *The Eunuch did not grasp it (Acts 8:30-31)*. Reply. Why? He was able to grasp the meaning of words, but he was unaware to whom it should be applied (v. 34).
2. *Many things are difficult to understand (2 Pet. 3:16)*. Reply. This refers to certain things in the letters of Paul not to the words or to the whole Scripture.
3. *Enlighten my eyes (Ps. 119:18)*. Reply. He seeks this because of his blindness not because of the obscurity of Scripture.
4. *Then why are they explained?* Reply. First, that we might make them easier for people; second, that we might draw out their contents; and third, that we might reject what is contrary to it.

§XV. In the question of whether someone without the grace of God can understand the Scripture, four things are to be noted:

1. It is one thing to easily grasp the meaning of the words in the Decalogue, the histories, and the Evangelists, which an attentive reader can easily do.
2. It is another thing to receive the truth with historical faith, which the unregenerate can also do (Acts 26:27).¹²
3. It is another thing to see and receive the saving goodness in it for oneself (Rom. 12:2),
4. And to commit oneself to it for salvation (Rom. 6:17).

The illuminating and regenerating Spirit is necessary for these last two.

Controversy – *Is the special illumination of the Holy Spirit and the renewal of the heart necessary for someone to understand the Scripture rightly, have faith in it, and perform obedience?* We affirm against the Socinians and the Arminians.

Arguments

1. Man cannot perceive the Scriptures *rightly* and subject himself to them without the aid of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:7; 1 Cor. 2:14, 12:3).
2. Because God illumines minds and renews hearts (Lk. 24:45, Acts 16:14, 2 Cor. 4:6).
3. Believers ask for this in prayers (Ps. 119:18, Jn. 17:17, Eph. 1:17).

¹² “Historical faith is that by which either the whole or part of the Word of God is held to be historically true (Acts 26:27, Jas. 2:19). Saving faith cannot exist without this faith, but historical faith alone does not suffice for salvation on account of the discrepancy of the will and the theoretical judgment,” Johannes à Marck, *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, XXII.7.

Objections

1. *Scripture is clear.* Reply. Our mind is blind by nature (2 Tim. 2:25-26).
2. *Eyes and ears do not need to be renewed.* Reply. They are only external instruments that follow the renewal of the mind not true judges.¹³
3. *If the unregenerate cannot understand the Scripture, it is proposed to them in vain.* Reply. They can understand this, which has been said before,¹⁴ and it is proposed to them if perhaps God might be pleased to give them the grace of conversion by these means (2 Tim. 2:25-26).

§XVI. From these attributes of Scripture, it follows that it is a canon and a norm for us of what is to be believed and what is to be done, by which all controversies of religion ought to be examined (Is. 8:20, Gal. 4:16).

Controversy – *Are the books of the O.T. also canon for Christians, and do arguments taken from them have the same authority as those from the N.T.?* We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.¹⁵

Arguments

1. The O.T. is the Word of God and thus of divine authority for everyone, including us, (2 Tim. 3:16, 2 Pet. 1:19); therefore, it is of the same authority as the N.T.
2. The O.T. is also commended in the N.T. as a divine canon and norm (Lk. 16:29, Jn. 5:39, Rom. 15:4).
3. The Christian religion does not abrogate the law (Rom. 3:31), and for that to happen is not possible (Jn. 10:35).
4. The Apostles take arguments from the O.T. in order to refute the Judaizers and erring Christians (Acts 18:28, Rom. 3:4, 1 Tim. 5:18).

¹³ This refers to literal, physical eyes and ears. God does not do anything to our physical eyes or ears in order to make us understand Scripture.

¹⁴ See §XV.1-2, p. 16.

¹⁵ “The Socinians and Anabaptists take away from the Scriptures of the Old Testament the property of canon under the New Testament from the hypothesis of a substantial difference between the Old and New Covenants,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 12.

Objections

1. *The law and the prophets prophesied until John (Lk. 16:16), but grace came through Jesus Christ (Jn. 1:17).* Reply. They prophesied of the Messiah to come, and when He comes, their prophecy remains divine. But grace came through Jesus Christ just as they predicted.
2. *We are not under the law (Rom. 6:14).* Reply. As condemning us and the ceremonial law.
3. *The first covenant has been abrogated (Heb. 8:7, Eph. 2:15).* Reply. The covenant of works and the ceremonial law, not the Scriptures of the O.T.
4. *It is a minister of death (2 Cor. 3:17).* Reply. Only if someone wants to be justified by it, as is true of the commandments found in the N.T.

§XVII. The Holy Spirit did the following things in respect to the writers of Scripture:

1. He moved them to write (2 Pet. 1:21).
2. He inspired the words (2 Tim. 3:16).
3. He kept them from all error (2 Pet. 2:2).

Controversy 1 – *Did the holy writers not write from any command of God but only from chance occasions according to their whims?* We deny against the Papists.¹⁶

Arguments

1. The holy writers wrote by the inspiration of the Spirit (2 Tim. 3:16, 2 Pet. 1:21), and inspiration is an internal command.
2. They were expressly commanded (Ex. 17:14, 34:37; Is. 8:1; Jer. 30:2; Rev. 1-2).
3. Scripture contains the word and commands of God to all men, including us (1 Cor. 15:27); therefore, He wanted it to be left to us in writing.

Objections

1. *They wrote because of present circumstances (Lk. 1:1).* Reply. The Spirit wanted them and commanded them to write for those present circumstances.

¹⁶ “The Papists teach that it was not from the express command of God but only from particular occasions that they were given to the Church that they might diminish the authority of Scripture,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 13.

Controversy 2 – *Did the sacred writers write everything, even the smallest words, by the instigation of the Holy Spirit?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹⁷

Arguments

1. The whole Scripture is divinely inspired and no part of it is of human invention (2 Tim. 3:16, 2 Pet. 1:20).
2. There is no jot of the law which is not commended as divine (Mt. 5:18-19), and it ought to be received as such (1 Thess. 2:13).
3. Scripture is uncorrupted in every part (1 Pet. 2:2) and pure (Ps. 12:6).

Objections

1. “...not the Lord, but I” (1 Cor. 8:12). Reply. This means: God in the O.T. had not given an express command concerning this matter as He now was doing through the Apostle (see v. 25).¹⁸
2. *Peter erred* (Gal. 2:11). Reply. In life, not in the writings.
3. “25 or 30 stadia” (Jn. 6:19). Reply. It was inspired and commanded that it be written in this way because it was between those two numbers.

Controversy 3 – *Has Holy Scripture been corrupted and distorted in many places in the authentic text itself?* We deny against the Socinians and Mohammedans, etc.¹⁹

Arguments

1. The same as the above arguments.

¹⁷ “Some think that they can get rid of all difficulties [in Scripture] by saying that the sacred writers could slip in memory or err in smaller things; so Socinus...,” Turretin, *IET*, II.v.3.

¹⁸ See *Ibid.*, II.iv.25.

¹⁹ “The question is not whether they are so pure that no defect has crept into the many manuscripts...but whether they are so corrupt that they can no longer be thought to be judge of controversies and the norm by which all versions are to be examined,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 14. The Mohammedans refer to the followers of Mohammed, that is, the Muslims. On the Muslims, see Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversarium*, 75-210. Hoornbeeck lists this as the third controversy and asks, “Are the Christian Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments corrupted in every part and distorted so that many things have been taken out of them and other things inserted into them? We deny,” 209.

2. This could not have occurred at the time of Christ or the Apostles, since they would have noted it, nor after, on account of the great number of manuscripts.
3. God promised that He will preserve His Word most faithfully (Lk. 16:17, Is. 59:21, 1 Pet. 1:25).
4. If the Jews had desired to corrupt any of it, they would have corrupted those parts that spoke against them the most, which they did not do.
5. On the contrary, the Jews numbered all the verses and the words.

Objections

1. *The kethib and keri:*²⁰ *one thing is written, another is read in the margins.* Reply. As it was written, thus the Holy Spirit inspired it. What is in the margin is added for the sake of explanation.²¹

Controversy 4 – *Have whole books, especially of the O.T., perished? We deny against the Socinians and Papists.*²²

Arguments

1. The same as the above arguments.

Objections

1. *Various books are cited, which are not found in the canon today (Num. 21:14, Jos. 10:13, 1 Chron. 29:29, 2 Chron. 9:29).* Reply. 1. These books are in the canon under other names. 2. Other books are cited, which are not canonical (Esth. 10:2).
2. *The Epistle to the Laodiceans has perished (Col. 4:16).* Reply. It does not read “to the Laodiceans” but “from the Laodiceans,” which could have been any of the Epistles of Paul which are extant.

²⁰ “So far are the *keri* and *kethib* (which amount to 848 in number) from corrupting the text that they rather show the various readings of copies by which all corruptions of later hands are excluded,” Francis Turretin, *IET*, II.x.11.

²¹ “They are only various readings by which every corruption of innovators is excluded,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 14. In the *CT*, there are seven objections listed on this question. The second is the “corrections of the scribes.” To this he replies, “They are critical readings explaining the meaning not changing words” *Ibid*.

²² “Most papists contend that many canonical books have been lost in order that thus they may prove the imperfection of Scripture and the necessity of tradition to supply its defects,” Francis Turretin, *Institutes*, II.vii.3.

§XVIII. The necessity of reading Holy Scripture is threefold:

1. Of command (Col. 4:16),
2. As a means of edification (Eph. 6:17),
3. And as signs, that we might show ourselves to be the sons of God (Jn. 8:31).

§XIX. And Scripture ought to be read:

1. With attention and understanding (Mt. 24:15),
2. With faith (Heb. 4:2),
3. Regularly (Col. 2:5),
4. Throughout our whole life (Dt. 17:19),
5. For memory (Heb. 11:1),
6. And with obedience (1 Thess. 2:13).

Controversy 1 – *Should the reading of Holy Scripture be commended and commanded not only to the pastors but also to the people?* We affirm the latter against the Papists.

Arguments

1. It has been commanded to all that they both read and know the Scripture (Dt. 6:6, 8; Jos. 1:8; Jn. 5:39; Col. 3:16, 4:16; 1 Thess. 5:27).
2. All who read the Word of God in a godly way are commended (Ps. 1:2, Acts 17:11, 2 Pet. 1:19, Rev. 1:3).
3. It is their holy armor against the armies of spirits (Eph. 6:17) and the testament of the Father (2 Cor. 3:14).
4. It has been written so that it might be read (Jn. 20:31, Rom. 15:4, Eph. 3:4).

Objections

1. *Heresies come from it.* Reply. These come from it because Holy Scripture is read neither well or enough.
2. *Many things in them are heard wrongly (malè sonant).* Reply. We hear many things wrongly from a distance that could be heard well. They should be read again and again (*recensentur*) that we might avoid this (1 Cor. 10:11).

Controversy 2 – *Should Holy Scripture, then, be translated into the common languages?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. It ought to be read publicly in the Church (*templo*) and privately in homes (Neh. 8:9, Acts 15:21).
2. The Apostles were sent to the nations equipped with knowledge of all languages that they might preach the Gospel to all nations (Acts 1:4, 8, 2:4, 6, 8, 11).
3. Having the Word of God heard in an unknown tongue is condemned (1 Cor. 14:21-22).
4. The exhortations to read, meditate on, etc. the Word of God would be useless (Is. 8:20, Lk. 16:29, Jn. 5:39).

Objections

1. *The Jews at the time of Ezra read Hebrew, which the people did not know.* Reply. On the contrary, it was well known (Acts 22:11).
2. *All the Apostles wrote in Greek not in the language of the Gentiles.* Reply. That language was then the most common.
3. *And what if they read the vernacular but do not understand it?* Reply. What if they do not? At least it would not happen through a defect of the language.
4. *Common languages change a great deal in single centuries.* Reply. Not in the meaning of the words, perhaps occasionally in a few words as to their pronunciation.

§XX. This translation, insofar as it relates (*proponit*) the thought of the Holy Spirit, has the same authority as the Hebrew O. T. and Greek N.T., but insofar as it is explained (*exponitur*) by French or Dutch words, it only has human authority.

§XXI. Since Scripture is known to be the Word of God from the things that it treats, not from the Hebrew and Greek languages, a common person can also know that translated Scripture is the Word of God:

1. From the things it expounds,
2. From its divine power in the conscience of him who reads and hears it in a godly way (Rom. 1:16),
3. And from the testimony of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 2:10-12).

§XII. The interpreters of Holy Scripture and the judges of controversies are threefold:

1. A *Sovereign (dominans)* and authoritative interpreter and judge, which is God alone (Lk. 24:27);
2. A *Ministerial* and public (*publicus*) interpreter and judge, which are Pastors (2 Tim. 4:2);

3. An *individual* discerning interpreter and judge, and this is each believer (1 Cor. 10:15).

The rule remains Scripture alone.

Controversy 1 – *Is there in the Church a visible and infallible judge of theological controversies besides Holy Scripture to whose opinions the other Pastors and laypeople ought to submit?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. No one has the same authority, knowledge, and infallibility as God speaking in His Word (Rom. 3:4, James 4:12).
2. When Holy Scripture enumerates the orders of the Church instituted by God, it does not list such a judge (Rom. 12:7-8, 1 Cor. 12:28, Eph. 4:11).
3. The rulers (*rectores*) of the Churches are not magistrates (*magistri*) of Holy Scripture or of the Church, but ministers of ministerial authority (Mt. 20:25, 23:10; 1 Cor. 3:5, 7, 4:1; 1 Pet. 5:3).
4. Our faith ought not to rest on the testimony of man or his authority (1 Cor. 7:23, 2 Cor. 1:24) but on the Word of God (Eph. 2:20).
5. The doctrine of the Church ought to be tested by the Scripture (Acts 17:11).

Objections

1. *Moses answered all doubtful things brought up concerning the law of God (Ex. 18:13).* Reply. Moses was a prophet. There are none such now, and he was referring the cases to God. He said nothing in a religious question on his own authority (v. 15).
2. *This text clearly sends cases to the living judge and high priest (Deut. 17:8).* Reply. They are sent to the political judge and the priests (v. 9), who were either to consult the mouth of God or explain to them the written law (v. 11-12); but not do anything on their own authority.
3. *When an opinion has been given by the chief Pastor, there ought to be a total submission to it (Ecc. 12:11).* Reply. Here are praised the words, not of some chief Pastor, but of the wise, who have been sent by the Chief Pastor, Christ or God.²³

²³ “This text refers to the True Priest of the New Testament, Christ, as the Papists themselves, such as Tirinus, Cornelius à Lapide, and others explain it,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 18.

4. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to you as a Gentile (Mt. 18:17); therefore, the judgment of Pastors is supreme.* Reply. A ministerial judgment is admissible for all Pastors, who are to be heard when they hear God as also in Mt. 23:2-3.

Controversy 2 – *If there is such a judge, is it the Roman Pope or a Council approved by him?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. Neither the Pope nor a Council has the requisite qualities of such a judge: divine authority, knowledge, infallibility, etc.
2. No one has given them such authority. God did not want to, and the Church could not.
3. They are a litigating party (*pars litigans*) that cannot be an authoritative judge in their own case.
4. Formerly, all those who were across the sea were not permitted to appeal to the Roman Bishop's chair (*cathedram*).²⁴
5. Many Popes were heretics.

Objection

1. *It is said to Peter "I give you the keys of the kingdom" (Mt. 16:18).* Reply. 1. The keys have been given to all (Jn. 20:21). 2. This refers to nothing other than ministerial authority (1 Cor. 4:1).
2. *"Feed my lambs" (Jn. 21:15).* Reply. This is the duty of all Pastors.
3. *"I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail" (Lk. 22:32).* Reply. As He prayed for all the faithful (Jn. 17:17). They are not on account of that prayer all kings of the Church, and in all these verses there is no word about the Roman Pope.

Controversy 3 – *Should Christians follow any special spirit and its revelations as a norm and judge of faith and morals?* We deny against the Enthusiasts and Libertines.

²⁴ "Until the year of the Lord 340, there was no respect had to the Church of Rome, but every church was ruled by their own government. Afterward followed the Counsel of Nicea, wherein it was decreed, that the whole Church should be divided into four circuits or precincts over which there were four metropolitans or patriarchs, [Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople]. All these had equal authority in their provinces, and one was not to deal with another's charge; therefore, the Bishop of Rome had not then the jurisdiction over the whole Church," Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi* [London: Thomas Man, 1592], 121.

Arguments

1. God sets forth His Word as a perpetual rule (Lk. 16:29, Gal. 4:6, 2 Tim. 1:13).
2. Peddling such revelations is condemned (Gal. 1:8, 2 Thess. 2:2, 1 Tim. 1:3, 1 Jn. 4:1).
3. Not all Christians are prophets who have special revelations (1 Cor. 12:29).
4. The Apostles themselves in disputes did not flee to revelations but followed the Word of God as the norm (Acts 26:22).
5. The revelations of these men are false and contrary to one another.

Objections

1. *They will all be taught by God (Jn. 6:45).* Reply. When they shall have His law written on their hearts (Jer. 31:33).
2. *“Whoever prophesies...” (1 Cor. 14:4).* Reply. It was a gift of a few who followed the Word of God.

Controversy 4 – *Is human reason a judge of controversies?* We deny against the Socinians.

This controversy was discussed in Chapter 1.²⁵

Controversy 5 – *Should each Christian discern and judge from the Word of God what the true religion is, and is he to that degree a judge of controversies for himself?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. God wants all to come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4).
2. They should test those things that are taught by Holy Scripture (1 Cor. 10:15, 1 Thess. 5:21, 1 Jn. 4:1).
3. Those who do this are commended (Acts 17:11, Rom. 2:18, Phil. 1:10, 1 Cor. 2:15).
4. Those who do not do this are rebuked (1 Cor. 15:34, Lk. 24:25).
5. Faith is not something blind but a reception of the Word by the intellect (Rom. 10:14, 17; Acts 24:14; Col. 1:6; 2 Tim. 2:25).
6. If this were not the case, our faith would rest on human testimony.

²⁵ See above, pp. 5-6.

Objections

1. *The lips of a priest shall preserve knowledge (Mal. 2:7).* Reply. 1. There it refers to Christ. 2. It certainly belongs to Pastors to explain publicly, but it belongs to the people to test the spirits (1 Jn. 4:1).
2. *Then religion depends on the judgment of each individual.* Reply. No, but it belongs to each one to see whether the religion that is taught has been taken from the Word of God.
3. *It is not of private interpretation (2 Pet. 1:20).* Reply. This means that the meaning is not what each one imagines, but the meaning ought to be proposed by the Holy Spirit.

§XXIII. The true sense of Scripture is that which agrees with the mind of the Holy Spirit, the circumstances of the passage, and the analogy of faith.

§XXIV. But this sense while comprehensive (*plurimum*) is only one, although it is in some places twofold:

1. Of the words (*verbalis*), that which is set forth by the words.
2. Of the thing itself (*realis*), that which is meant by the thing set forth, such as when, first, a lamb is referred to, but, secondly, Christ is understood (Jn. 19:36).²⁶

Controversy 1 – *Are there four diverse senses in every text: literal, allegorical, anagogical, and tropological?* We deny against the Papists.²⁷

Controversy 2 – *Are there two literal senses in the same place?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. The Word of God is useful for teaching (2 Tim. 3:15); therefore, it should set forth a meaning that is certain.
2. Arguments can be sought (*peti*) only from the literal sense.²⁸

²⁶ “The literal sense is that which the letter itself or the words taken in their genuine signification carry. And because the genuine signification of the words is that in which the author uses them, whether speaking properly or figuratively, therefore, the literal sense is subdivided into plain and simple, and figurative, which arises from the words translated from their natural signification into another as when Christ says, ‘I have other sheep that are not of this fold’ (Jn. 10:16), He means other people besides the Jews,” Edward Leigh, *Body of Divinity*, 125.

²⁷ The anagogical sense refers to what the text tells us about heaven or the end of the world. The tropological sense refers to morals.

3. The Word of God is clear, perspicuous, and without deceit (*infucatus*); therefore, it cannot have a uncertain senses (Ps. 12:6, 1 Pet. 2:2).
4. It is not of human interpretation (2 Pet. 1:20); consequently, the sense is not that which teachers (*doctores*) imagine but that which can be proved to be the intended by the Holy Spirit is the only sense.

Objection

1. *Gal. 4:24, 1 Cor. 9:8-10*. Reply. We concede that one thing is often a type of another thing, but this does not hold true in every place and should not be what we imagine but what is found in Holy Scripture.

²⁸ That is, proofs for particular doctrines may only be sought from the literal sense, and this should be understood in light of §XXIV.

Chapter 3

God

§I. God is:

1. An independent being,
2. Upon whom all things depend,
3. And who governs and preserves all things.

Controversy – *Does God or such a supreme (primum) and most perfect being exist?* We affirm against the Atheists.

Arguments

1. From the essence of creatures. Where there is a created and dependent being, there must necessarily be a creator and a supreme (*primum*) and independent being.
2. From the origin (*principio*) of creatures. All creatures had a beginning (*principium*), and it has been given to them by God. Which came first, the chicken or the egg? One of them had to be created by God.
3. From the wonders (*miraculi*) of nature: its constant order; the movement of the sun, moon, and stars; spring and fall; life and the transformation of food into the body. All of these can only exist by an infinite wisdom.

Objections

1. *All things are from nature.* Reply. Nature is only the particular (*singularis*) nature of each individual thing.
2. *There are many things that are useless in the world.* Reply. Nothing is always useless. What is useless to man is useful to others.
3. *Many bad things happen to the good worshippers of God, and many good things happen to His despisers.* Reply. Hard and painful things are not always evil things (*mala*).

§II. The knowledge of God, in relation to the means by which it is attained, is either *natural* or through nature, *revealed* through the *Word*, or *spiritual* through the Holy Spirit.

§III. We know four things about God:

1. Names.
2. Essence.
3. Persons.
4. Works.

§IV. The Hebrew names are *Jehovah* (LORD), *Adonai* (Lord), *Elohim* (God), and *El Shaddai* (God Almighty). The Greek names are *Theos* (God), *Kurios* (Lord), and *Despotēs* (Sovereign).

Controversy 1 – *Are the words substance, essence, nature, and persons of the Trinity rightly predicated of God?* We affirm against the Anabaptists.¹

Arguments

1. Scripture has the same and similar abstract words (Rom. 1:20, Gal. 4:8, Phil. 2:6).
2. Scripture also has concrete names from which such abstract words are formed, such as Three (1 John 5:7) and Alpha and Omega (Rev. 1:8).
3. What is expressed in these words is truly in God.

Objections

1. *The words of Scripture are enough, and human expressions are not necessary.* Reply. These are words of Scripture, whose concrete forms, roots, and similes we have in it.

Controversy 2 – *Is “Jehovah”² the proper name for God, which Scripture does not communicate to any creature?* We affirm against the Socinians.³

¹ “All these things must be held because of the persistence of the heretics who have attempted to eliminate these words as foreign in order that they might destroy the thing itself. If there were agreement concerning the issue, then we would not have to belabor this argument about the words,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 24-25.

² I use this spelling for the Tetragrammaton throughout because this is what Rijssen used in the original Latin version.

³ “This question comes between us and the Socinians who maintain that this name can be communicated to various creatures in order to elude the argument we are accustomed to draw from this name to prove the divinity of Christ,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 25.

Arguments

1. God alone is Jehovah (Ps. 83:18, Is. 37:20, 45:6).
2. It is the proper and distinctive name of God (Is. 42:8, 47:4; Ex. 15:3; Hos. 12:6; Amos 5:8).
3. Hence it is called “great,” “holy,” and “terrible” (Jer. 10:6, Ps. 99:3).
4. “Jehovah” means an independent being on whom all things depend (Ex. 3:14, Ps. 96:5, Is. 44:24).

Objections

1. *An angel is called Jehovah (Gen. 16:13, 18:13).* Reply. An uncreated angel, who is Christ (16:10), the Judge of the whole earth (18:25).
2. *Another being is called Jehovah (Ex. 17:15).* Reply. No, this refers to God Himself, who alone was the banner of Moses.
3. *Jerusalem is called Jehovah (Ez. 48:35).* Reply. The city is not called Jehovah, but it says this because God is present there.⁴

Controversy 3 – *Do the names of God (Theos, Elohim, etc.) denote the essence of God or only rule, power, and office?* We affirm the former and deny the latter against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Then men who have been established in power would strictly-speaking (*proprie*) be God (*theos*) and *Elohim* contrary to 1 Cor. 8:5-6.
2. The abstract word “divinity” signifies nature not office (Acts 17:29, Rom. 1:20, Col. 2:9).
3. God is not God on account of the world or His rule in it but on account of His nature (Gal. 4:8).
4. God was God from eternity before there were any creatures (Rom. 1:20, 16:26).

Objections

1. *Men are also called gods.* Reply. They have the name not the essence. They are called “gods” because of some similarity with the majesty, power, righteousness, and, in that respect, the essence of God, just as they are called *angels* on account of their wisdom and holiness.

⁴ “Not because this city will be called by this name but because this epithet will most justly agree with it,” Matthew Poole, *Synopsis Criticorum*, 3:col. 1312.

2. *God is the God of gods* (Ps. 136:2). Reply. Of those who are called gods (1 Cor. 8:5).
3. *I said, "You are gods"* (Ps. 82:6, Jn. 10:34). Reply. "You are like God"; consequently, the word "God" in this verse certainly refers to essence and attributes.
4. *Idols are gods*. Reply. To those who worship them as gods.

§V. The attributes of God are His perfections that tell us what sort of being (*qualis*) He is.

§VI. But they are deduced from the word and works of God:

1. Through the *negative way* (via negationis), removing from God all imperfections. He is not like gold and not finite (Acts 17:29).
2. Through the *way of causality*, positing in God the true perfections of the creatures but in a more eminent way (*eminentiori modo*), such as power, will, and knowledge (Ps. 94:9).

§VII. And since the former deny that God is like the creatures, insofar as they are creatures, and the latter teach that He exceeds the perfections of the creatures, some of the attributes are said to be *incommunicable* and others *communicable*. Thus, you can speak of those attributes that are *dissimilar* and those that are *similar* to the attributes of the creatures.

§VIII. However, all these attributes are in God in this way:

1. In the concrete and abstract. God is good as well as goodness and is light (1 Jn. 1:5).
2. And thus these attributes are in God in a way that they are found in nothing else: "Only wise" (1 Tim. 1:17).
3. So that all things can be affirmed of Him by an exchange. His power is eternal, eternity powerful, infinity holy, etc.
4. And inasmuch as these are not distinct from the essence or from one another, they are only distinguished in our manner of conception.⁵

§IX. The attributes of God are certainly innumerable, but it has been especially revealed to us that He is a spirit, one, eternal, supreme, infinite, immutable, simple, wise, etc.

⁵ "The divine attributes are distinguished from the essence either *noematikos*, in relation to a diverse formal conception, or also objectively and effectively in relation to the various objects and external effects," Turretin, *Compendium*, 26. For a very helpful discussion of the variety of statements on the relationship of the attributes to one another and to God's essence, see Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 1:284-296. Here he gives an overview of how the Reformed theologians sought to maintain a distinction in the attributes that did not make a real (*realis*) distinction in God or divide Him into parts.

§X. Spirituality is an attribute by which God is without matter in all that He is.

Controversy – *Is God a spirit without body and body parts?* We affirm against Vorstius.⁶

Arguments

1. The angels are spirits without bodies (Lk. 24:39), and so much more God, since He is said to be a spirit (Jn. 4:24) and the Father of spirits (Heb. 12:9).
2. God does not have eyes of flesh (Job 10:4) or live in a house of clay (Job 4:19) and is not like a body (Is. 40:18).
3. Every body (*corpus*) is created, divisible, and less perfect than spirit (Is. 31:3), which cannot be the case in God.
4. The Son alone is God manifested in one flesh not two (1 Tim. 3:16).

Objections

1. *Entrails, eyes, and a hand are ascribed to God.* Reply. By an anthropopathism,⁷ God does such things by His spiritual power that men do by bodily action.
2. *He can be seen (1 Jn. 3:2).* Reply. Christ by the eyes of the body and God with the mind.

§XI. The *oneness* (*unitas*) of God is that by which He is the only one in all that He is (Is. 44:8), and this also refers to His simplicity.

§XII. For God, through, as it were, generic unity (*quasi genericam*) is all that He is and through *numerical* unity, He is that alone.

Controversy 1 – *Is all that is in God God Himself so that there are not many beings (entia) in Him?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.⁸

⁶ Conrad Vorstius (1569-1622) was a German theologian who was appointed as Arminius' successor at Leyden. He was suspected of Socinianism, and, under pressure from King James of England, was removed from his post. See the various histories of the Synod of Dort and the Arminian controversy that surrounded it.

⁷ "It is a metaphor by which human characteristics are attributed to God because of some similarity," Amandus Polanus, *Partitiones Theologicae* [London: Edmond Bollifant, 1591], 5.

⁸ "The Socinians deny that simplicity can be attributed to God according to the Scriptures for no other purpose than to more easily weaken the mystery of the Trinity by establishing composition in the divine essence. The Arminians allege that this

Arguments

1. God is the origin (*principium*) of all things, the Alpha and the Omega, and derived from none; therefore, He has not been composed (*compositus*) from parts (Rev. 1:8).
2. God swears and creates by Himself (Heb. 6:13, Is. 44:24) but swears by His holiness and creates by His power (Amos 4:2, Rom. 1:20); therefore, the attributes are God Himself.
3. God is a most perfect being, but it is more perfect to be composed from no parts than to be composed of any parts.
4. There cannot be two uncreated things (Is. 45:6), but a finite and created thing cannot be united with the infinite and uncreated in one being.

Objections

1. *[This] definition of God does not agree with attributes. 2. The attributes are many and contrary, such as mercy and justice. Reply. As they are in God, all are one and the same, but we are forced to consider them in distinct conceptions.*
2. *The decrees were able not to be but God was not. Reply. The action of decreeing, which itself is the essence of God, was not able not to be; but what the decree determines, such as Paul's conversion, was able not to be.*⁹
3. *There are many persons in God. Reply. But not many beings (entia).*

Controversy 2 – *Besides the Most High God, are there others who are strictly-speaking (proprie dicti) "gods" and have true divinity? We deny against the Socinians.*

Arguments

1. There is only one God, and there is no other besides Him (Is. 44:6, Mk. 13:32, 1 Cor. 8:6).

doctrine is merely metaphysical," Turretin, *Compendium*, 26. See Gisbertus Voetius, *Selectarum Disputationum Theologicarum* (Utrecht: Johannes à Wansberg, 1648) 1:226-245.

⁹ "The divine decrees also pertain to the attributes of God, if they are considered absolutely, subjectively, and in relation to God, and thus the decree of God is God decreeing just as His omniscience is God knowing all things. But if they are considered relationally, terminatively, or in relation to the creatures or their objects, then they are more from God than in God and thus most free and manifold in relation to our understanding," Samuel Maresius, *Collegium Theologicum*, II.xx.

2. To be a man, an angel, or God are contrary to one another, and something cannot be said to be any two of them in the same sense and respect (Is. 31:3, Acts 14:15).
3. Only one created the heaven (Is. 44:24). Whoever has not done this is not true God (Jer. 10:11).

Objections

1. *Magistrates are gods.* Reply. By a metaphor, such as a man is a god, angel, or wolf to another man.
2. *Christ has been made lord (Acts 2:36).* Reply. As Mediator, not as God.

§XIII. Eternity is that by which God is without beginning, succession, or ending in all that He is (Gen. 21:33, Rom. 16:26).

Controversy – *Is there a succession of before and after in the eternal existence of God?* We deny against the Socinians and Arminians.¹⁰

Arguments

1. There are no days or years in the duration of God (2 Pet. 3:8); therefore, there is no succession.
2. God cannot grow old or be changed (James 1:17); therefore, there is no succession.
3. Where there was no first, there can be no second or anything that follows it.

Objections

1. *God is, was, and will be (Rev. 1:4).* Reply. He is the same in the time of the creatures in the past, present, and future.
2. *Years are attributed to God (Dan. 7:9).* Reply. He who is eternal has also lived during all the days of the world.
3. *Then all times existed at the same time in eternity.* Reply. No, but the same eternity is in all times when they exist (*sunt*).

§XIV. The *primacy* or independence of God is that by which God is derived from none in all that He is and by which the creatures are derived from Him in all that they are (Rom. 11:35-36).

¹⁰ On this and the following controversies, see Johann Friedrich Stapfer, *Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae*, XII.95-103.

§XV. Consequently, God is said to be independent in relation to essence, persons, attributes, and actions, since there is no physical or moral cause of these things outside of God (Rev. 1:8).

§XVI. The *immensity* or infinity of God is that by which God is without measure and limit in all that He is, which is called both *omnipresence*, since God is present in the whole world, and *infinity*, because He is not contained in the world.

Controversy 1 – *Is God present by His essence in every place in the world?* We affirm against the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Arminians.¹¹

Arguments

1. He is present to all creatures (Acts 17:27, Ps. 135:6).
2. He fills heaven and earth (Jer. 23:23, Is. 66:1).
3. He creates and preserves all things through Himself; therefore, He Himself is present to all (Is. 44:24).
4. Otherwise Christ walking on the earth would not be true God, or the true God was not in heaven. Instead, Christ dragged His divinity from place to place with Him.

Objections

1. *God is in heaven.* Reply. Also on earth (Jos. 2:11).
2. *He would be contaminated by unclean places (Dt. 23:13-14).* Reply. No more than a soul is contaminated by an unclean body, for He is spirit. But common honesty is also commanded to be observed on account of God (Dt. 23).
3. *God is said to descend and not be in the wind (1 Kings 19:11).* Reply. As to extraordinary signs.
4. *He is far from the ungodly.* Reply. As to grace and help.

Controversy 2 – *Is the essence of God finite, and does it contain certain imperfections (crimines)?* We deny against the same.

¹¹ “The Socinians and Vorstius propose an infinity improperly so-called, for they do not want God to be simply and actually infinite, even though they admit that He is often said to be infinite in relation to us,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 28. “Having denied the simplicity of God, they stated that God was present in the world by a power distinct from His essence” Stapfer, *Institutiones Polemicae*, XII.102-103.

Arguments

1. The heaven of heavens cannot contain (*circumscribunt*) Him (1 Kings 8:27, Job 11:7-8).
2. As the attributes, so the essence. Since the power and wisdom of God are infinite, His essence is also infinite (Ps. 145:3).
3. Every finite thing has been defined (*definitum est*) by something else that gave it such form and limits, but this cannot be said of God.

Objections

1. *Every being requires limits by which it differs from something else.* Reply. A created being does. The uncreated being is distinguished from others by its infinity.
2. *God would be equal to a lesser and a greater thing, and thus He would be bigger than Himself.* Reply. This has no place in a spirit, especially an infinite one. The spirit of a grown man is not bigger than it was when he was an infant. There was a legion of demons in one man.

§XVII. God is present to the creatures in these ways:

1. To all by essence.
2. To the godly also by grace.
3. To the blessed (*beatis*) by glory.
4. To the ungodly by judgment.
5. To Christ by a personal union.

§XVIII. The immutability of God is that by which God never is or can be anything other than what He is (Jas. 1:17). For when He creates and punishes, He is not changed, but the creature is changed.

§XIX. The understanding (*intellectus*) of God is the faculty by which He knows all things that are and are not and that will and will not be.

§XX. The knowledge of God differs from that of the creatures:

1. In the *objects*. God knows all things.
2. In the *mode*. He knows all things through His essence (*per essentiam*).
3. In *degree*. He knows all things perfectly.

§XXI. The knowledge of God is commonly divided into *simple intelligence*, by which He knows the essences of things and of *vision*, by which He knows future things. But since it ought to be divided according to the

distinction of things (*rerum*), it is better said to be knowledge of possible, future, existing, or past things. Others think natural or free.¹²

Controversy 1 – *Does God foreknow future contingent¹³ events and the free actions of creatures?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹⁴

Arguments

1. He knows all things and therefore also contingent future events (1 Jn. 3:20, Heb. 4:13).
2. He is expressly said to foreknow them (Ps. 139:2, Gen. 18:19).
3. He foretells them (1 Kings 13:2, Is. 46:10, Zech. 11:12, Mk. 14:30).
4. And this very thing distinguishes Him from idols (Is. 41:22-23).
5. Otherwise, nothing would be able to work out according to the counsel of His will (Acts 4:28, Eph. 1:11).

Objections

1. *They are not truly determined.* Reply. In relation to second causes, but they certainly are in relation to the providence of God (Acts 2:23).
2. *God is said to look for things that do not come to pass (Is. 5) and to be led to repentance.* Reply. All of these things are said anthropopathically, since He does those things which men normally do when they feel that way (*affecti sunt*).
3. *It takes away human freedom.* Reply. Not at all, for human freedom is founded on it because by a preceding election man does what he wants.
4. *It takes away the freedom of God, because He cannot change anything.* Reply. The freedom of God means He freely carries out what He freely decreed to carry out, not that He can act contrary to knowledge.

¹² “[Natural is] the knowledge that God, according to His nature must necessarily have; infinite and perfect knowledge both of the divine being itself and of all possibilities.” “[Free is] the knowledge by which God knows what actually exists because of His will,” Richard Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* [Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1985], 276 and 275.

¹³ “A contingent event or thing is a nonnecessary event or thing that either might not exist or could be other than it is,” *Ibid.*, 81.

¹⁴ “The Socinians deny this in order to more easily assert the indifference of free will and to make it free from that necessity that arises from God’s foreknowledge,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 29.

Controversy 2 – *Did God before the decree see through a certain middle knowledge what creatures would do independently from Him positing a certain condition?*¹⁵ We deny against the Jesuits and the Arminians.¹⁶

Arguments

1. By this middle knowledge, the creatures would be established as a first causes, acting independently from God contrary to Prov. 16:9 and Jer. 10:23.
2. By this middle knowledge, future things would be established as future by themselves and not through the decree of God contrary to Rom. 11:36 and Rev. 4:11.
3. By this middle knowledge, God is thought to cause neither good things nor evil things, but to approve all things as they were already necessarily future before His decree contrary to Zeph. 1:12 and Rom. 9:18.
4. Nor would there then be any fleeing to God for refuge in trials or to giving thanks to God for prosperity contrary to Ps. 50:15.

Objections

1. *If David remains in Keilah, they shall betray him (1 Sam. 23:12).*
Reply. This means that they intend to betray him and will betrayed him with God concurring in the ordinary way.¹⁷
2. *If Tyre had seen these since, they would have converted (Mt. 11:21).*
Reply. According to the ordinary course of means, because their hearts were less hard.¹⁸

¹⁵ “Middle knowledge [is] a term used to describe a category in the divine knowing according to which God has a conditioned or consequent, rather than an absolute and antecedent, foreknowledge of future contingents,” Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, 276.

¹⁶ “The Jesuits have devised a middle freedom in order to establish their idol of free will and election from foreseen faith and good works before all natural knowledge. They call this God’s foreknowledge concerning future conditioned events whose actuality does not depend on the decree of God but on the liberty of the creature concerning whom God foresaw how it would determine itself if such and such order of things would happen. This excited such quarrels between the Dominicans and the Jesuits that not even the Pope up to the present time has been able to put a stop to them,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 30.

¹⁷ “This does not refer to hypothetical future action but to the plan and intention of betraying David, which Keilah did have,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 30.

¹⁸ “This text contains a proverbial way of speaking, where Christ exaggerates the contumacy of the Jews, as we also say: ‘If I taught a donkey this long, he would not be ignorant.’ There is a similar way of speaking in Lk. 19:40: ‘If they are silent, the rocks will cry out,’” Turretin, *Compendium*, 31.

3. *If you had hit the ground more times... (2 Kings 13:18-19).* Reply. But not at all without the help of God, who had said to the Prophet, “If he hits the ground many more times, then I will cause him to subjugate the Syrians.”

§XXII. Thus far the knowledge of God. *The will is that by which He wills or does not will that which He knows.* But will is understood:

1. As a sort of faculty that is of itself indifferent to these things and those objects (Eph. 1:11).
2. As the act of establishing one thing or another (Rev. 4:11).
3. As a conclusion or an established decree (*sententia*) (James 4:15).

§XXIII. But the will either concerns God Himself in love and approbation or the creatures.

§XXIV. The will that concerns the creatures:

1. Is sometimes *real* (*realis*), determining the existence or non-existence of things or events (Eph. 1:11);
2. Is sometimes *moral*, commanding virtues, forbidding vice, and promising a reward (1 Thes. 4:3);
3. And is at other times *permitting* when it refers to sins (Rom. 9:22).

The will is commonly thought of as hidden and revealed or of sign and good pleasure but confusedly and badly.

§XXV. The properties of this will are that it is:

1. Holy.
2. Free.
3. Eternal.
4. Immutable.
5. Efficacious.

Controversy 1 – *Is the real (realis)¹⁹ will of God sometimes antecedent, by which He desires something in Himself, not in relation to circumstances, before foreknowledge, and at other times consequent, by which, after having foreseen the act of the creature, He decides the contrary?* We deny against the Socinians and Arminians.²⁰

¹⁹ See §XXIV, p. 39.

²⁰ “The new Pelagians want the antecedent will to be that by which God desires something in a rational creature before all or any act of that creature. They define consequent will as by which He desires something in a rational creature after their act or actions,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 31. The next three questions deal with the same point. The goal of the opponents is to establish a free will independent of God’s determination. In the *Compendium* and *Institutes*, Turretin explains that these distinctions could be accepted in some sense but that even when understood properly,

Arguments

1. God would desire by antecedent will that which He sees that He will not effect contrary to Ps. 33:11 and Job 42:2.
2. The consequent will would depend on the creatures, and God would not show mercy on whom He wills but on the one who wills contrary to Rom. 9:16 and 18.
3. God would will opposite things and be deprived every day of previous desires contrary to Ps. 135:6 and Eph. 1:11.
4. The foreknowledge of God is eternal, and nothing precedes it (Acts 15:18).

Objections

1. *Christ wanted in this manner to gather all (Mt. 23:37).* Reply. By His human will, “How long have I wanted”?
2. *At first He wanted Isaac to die, then afterwards to live (Gen. 22).* Reply. He did not will in the sense of determine but rather commanded. He wanted first to command it and afterwards to forbid it.
3. *By an antecedent will He wants all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:4).* Reply. As if He had decreed the salvation of individuals, even of the damned? The meaning is, “God commands that we strive after the salvation of men of whatever state or condition.”

Controversy 2 – *Are there capricious desires or inefficacious desires (optationes) in God, which are called wishes (velleitates)?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. The same as the above arguments.
2. Whoever does not get which he had desired is not blessed (Lam. 3:18), but God is blessed (1 Tim. 6:15).
3. Why should He wish for something in vain, when He can do all things (Lk. 1:37)?

Objections

1. *“O that they would hear...” (Ps. 81:14).* Reply. God commands prophets to propound the good of the thing in desirable words. He Himself does not wish.

they are not the best way to explain the distinctions within the will of God (see Turretin, *Compendium*, 31-32 and *Institutes*, III.xv-xvi).

Controversy 3 – *Is God’s will always absolute, firm, and efficacious and never conditioned, weak, or inefficacious?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. Everything God wills is a definite decree (Acts 2:23), but the conditioned is not fully defined.
2. Possible events become future events by the will of God (Rev. 4:11), but nothing that is conditioned is made future. All things remain uncertain.
3. The one who obeys as well as the one who does not obey would fulfill the same will of God: “If you are godly, I will save you; if ungodly, I will condemn you.”
4. No thought of God is so weak that it could be rescinded (Job 42:2, Is. 46:10).

Objections

1. *Then there is no place for reward or virtue, since God causes all things.* Reply. We may not as if had been the first cause acting alone without God, but we may certainly be as second causes who act by the power and grace of God (Phil. 2:12-13).
2. *Then God commands many things, which He does not seriously want, since they do not happen.* Reply. If “want” means “commands,” God seriously commands and wants to command; but if “want” means “decree,” God does not decree all things that He commands (Ex. 7:2-3).
3. *Then He is the cause of sin.* Reply. He decrees to permit not cause (*facere*) sin.

Controversy 4 – *Are, then, any passions of soul truly found in God?* We deny against the same.

Argument

1. Because all passions are opposed to the perfection, blessedness, omnipotence, knowledge, and immutability of God (cf. Num. 23:19, Ps. 115:3, James 1:17).

Objection

1. *But they are attributed to God.* Reply. 1. In relation to the effect not the affection. 2. The prophets are accustomed to explain in such words the nature of the *event (rei)* not *God*.

§XXXVI. The *moral* will of God only extends to the moral goodness or wickedness of something that God wants to propose to the creature. While it is often not fulfilled, the *determining* and *permitting* will is always fulfilled (2 Chron. 25:16).

§XXXVII. It is inquired here: Is the will of God prior to every rule of holiness? Or is something good or bad only in relation to it?

Reply. 1. The will of God is not the only cause of the following connections: “God is holy, virtue is good, and sin is evil.” 2. God could not even hypothetically fail to prescribe what is good or forbid evil. God cannot command man to hate God, virtue, and truth, but He has to prescribe as He loves.

But the first cause of why God wants man to be good and actually to prescribe it to him because it is good is only the will of God.

Thus the first actual obligation of the creature is to the will of the Creator (Lk. 22:42).

§XXXVII. The power of God is the faculty by which God can effect what He wants and what He desires, which is set forth in Holy Scripture:

1. Positively, that He is omnipotent (Rev. 1:8).
2. Negatively, that nothing is impossible for Him (Lk. 1:37).
3. Comparatively, that He can do what no one else can (Mt. 3:9, 19:26).

§XXXVIII. This power of God is often distinguished into *absolute*, by which He is able to effect all that He wants before the decree (Mt. 3:9), and *ordained*, by which He is able to do what He wants after He has decreed it (Ps. 115:3). However, absolute power is indeed independent from the decree of God but not from the nature of God (2 Tim. 2:13).²¹

§XXXIX. The righteousness (*Justitia*) and holiness of God is that by which God is without iniquity in all that He is.

§XXX. Therefore, through righteousness:

1. God is righteous (Dt. 32:4).
2. God determines, wills, and commands righteous things (Zeph. 3:5).
3. He acts righteously (Ps. 145:17) in nature (Ps. 119:137), damnation (2 Thes. 1:6), and glorification (2 Tim. 4:8).

Controversy – *Is the essence of God so righteous that He cannot allow sin to go unpunished?* We affirm against the Socinians.²²

²¹ The original text has 1 Tim. 1:13, but 2 Tim. 2:13 seems to fit much better.

²² “The Socinians deny that there is any attribute in God that necessarily demands satisfaction for sin in order to more easily destroy the satisfaction of Christ,”

Arguments

1. The threat of death is placed upon sin committed (Gen. 2:17), and this threat must be fulfilled (2 Tim. 2:13).
2. There is a greater antipathy between God and the sinner than between light and darkness (2 Cor. 6:14); therefore, He can only turn away from him in disgust (Prov. 3:32).
3. God cannot not be the judge of all things whose judgment is according to truth and must be righteous (Gen. 18:25, Ex. 20:7, Rom. 2:2).

Objections

1. *God forgives sin freely (Mt. 18:27).* Reply. With respect to us, who pay nothing, but not to Christ, who made satisfaction (Rom. 3:25).
2. *He has mercy on whom He wants (Rom. 9:18).* Reply. But by no means to the injury of justice, since He punishes in the Mediator the sins of those to whom He freely wants to be merciful.
3. *He can remit sins by His own authority (de jure).* Reply. He cannot part with justice anymore than His essence (2 Cor. 6:14, 2 Tim. 2:13).

§XXXI. The mercy (*miseriordia*) of God is only His goodness, which is *metaphysically*, His sufficiency; *morally*, His holiness; *effectively*, His freely willing to produce creatures and, once produced, to do good to them, whether in nature (Ps. 148:8-9) or in grace (Lk. 1:78).

§XXXII. The sovereignty of God over creatures is His power to bring about amongst them that which He desires, by which He does these six things:

1. Determines them to the end that He wants (Rom. 9:18).
2. Gives them the essence that He wants (Acts 17:25).
3. Prescribes what He wants (Gen. 22:2).
4. Works in them what He wants (Phil. 2:13).
5. Permits and allows the evil that He wants (1 Sam. 3:18).
6. Nor owes any a reason for it (Rom. 9:20).

§XXXIII. The foundation of this divine sovereignty *in God* is only His eminence and primacy (Rom. 9:20-21). In *creatures*, certain acts do not require a foundation such as destination and creation. Other acts, such as judgments, have a foundation:

1. The dependence of the creature on God.

Turretin, *Compendium*, 33. Note the issue among the Orthodox in Turretin, *Compendium*, 32-33; *Institutes*, III.xix.9.

2. The covenant with them.
3. Their performance of good or evil.

Chapter 4

The Trinity

§I. Thus far we have considered the essence of God; we now turn to consider the persons in the Godhead. For something to be called a person, it is required:

1. That it be a substance (*substantia*).
2. Intelligent (*intelligens*).
3. Not a part of another.
4. Not sustained by another.

Therefore, person means the complete state (*statum*) of an intelligent substance (*substantia*).

§II. Divine person does not mean an essence alone or only the mode of subsistence but an essence existing in such a mode (*essentiam tali modo se habentem*).

§III. There are three such persons in God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and insofar as they are persons each one is distinct from the other as someone and someone else (*alius & alius*), all having the same numerical essence (*homoousioi*) (Mt. 28:19).

§IV. The names *God*, *Father*, and *Spirit* in Scripture are sometimes used for the essence (*essentialiter*) and other times for one of the persons (*personaliter*) (Jn. 3:16, Acts 20:28).

§V. The essence neither produces an essence or a person, and a person does not produce an essence. Only the persons are producing or produced.

§VI. This production is a natural not a free act and therefore necessary, eternal, infinite, and internal (Jn. 1:18).

§VII. A divine person differs from the essence and from the other persons.¹ Substantive [*reales*] and modal [*modales*] distinctions are

¹ The original text inserts at this point “ut persona divina ab essentia, atque ab alia persona.” This seems to be a typographical error, and so I have omitted it.

distinctions in creatures, and there is nothing in creatures similar to the distinctions in the Trinity.

Controversy 1 – *Are there many (plures) divine essences?* We deny against Vorstius & Episcopus.²

Arguments

1. There is only one God; therefore, there is only one essence (1 Cor. 8:6, Jn. 17:3).
2. Holy Scripture speaks of only one divinity (Rom. 1:20, Acts 17:29).
3. All things have been created by only one and of one power (Is. 44:24, Rom. 11:36); therefore, there is only one essence (Jer. 10:11).
4. Otherwise, it could not be said that there is only one essentially (*per essentiam*) good (Lk. 18:19), wise (Rom. 16:27), and powerful (1 Tim. 6:15-16).³

Objections

1. *They are someone and someone else (alius et alius).* Reply. Not one thing and another thing (*aliud et aliud*).
2. *They are truly distinct and are capable of their own individual actions.* Reply. They are not in relation to the essence but are in relation to the persons.

Controversy 2 – *Are there several (plures) distinct persons in that one essence?* We Affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Since many do the same work, “*Elohim Bara*, God created” (Gen. 1:1, Jos. 24:19), “He is the God who judges” (Ps. 58:11).⁴

² “The Arminians evidently lean towards the Socinians. For although they may wish to appear to differ from them by asserting the generation of the Son, yet in explaining it they sufficiently betray their agreement denying the consubstantiality (*homoousian*) of the Son with the Father and maintaining that the Son (not only in order, but also in dignity and power) differs from the Father and is not coordinate and consubstantial with him, but only subordinate (as Episcopus has it in *Institutiones theologicae*, 4.32 and 4.35 in *Opera Theologica* [1678], pp. 332-34, 340-44),” Turretin *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, III.xxviii.4.

³ See Chap. 3, §VIII, p. 31.

⁴ The word for God, *Elohim*, has a plural form but is used with a singular verb. To translate each word literally according to this construction would give us a phrase that does not work in English grammar, “Gods creates,” but in Hebrew this grammatical

2. God says of Himself, “we,” “us” (Gen. 1:26, 3:22, 11:7).
3. Several persons are the same Jehovah (Gen. 19:24, Jer. 23:5-6⁵).

Objections

1. *Kings speak that way, “We, Charles.”* Reply. Not with a singular verb, not “We Charles, I command (*mando*) this,” but, “We Charles, we command this (*mandamus*).”
2. *They want to imitate God by this.*
2. *In Genesis 1 and 3, God is speaking to the angels.* Reply. It says, “in our image,” which is the image of God; but the angels are not God, nor was man created in their image.
3. *Psalm 82 predicates “God (Elohim)” of men.* Reply. This does not refer to one but many, “You are gods.”⁶ *Objection. In Exodus 4:16, He said to Moses, “You will be God (Elohim) to him.”* Reply. This means he was in the place of God.

Controversy 3 – *Are there three distinct persons in that one essence?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Three are expressly referred to as being of the same authority (1 Jn. 5:7, Jn. 15:26).
2. In the sending (*missione*) of the Son, three appear (Mt. 3:16, Is. 48:16).
3. In Baptism, we are consecrated by three as one God (Mt. 28:19).
4. Salvation is sought from three as one God (2 Cor. 13:14).

Objections

1. *Every person is an intelligent substance; therefore, where there are three persons, there are three substances.* Reply. No, each person in God is an intelligent substance through the same numerical essence.
2. *The one God is three in persons. The Father is that one God. Therefore, the Father is three persons.* Reply. The word “God” is

construction is often used with this word. Similarly, the Hebrew of Psalm 58:11 could literally be read, “He is the Gods (*elohim*) who judge.”

⁵ The original has Jer. 27:6, but Jer. 23:5-6 seems better suited to prove his point.

⁶ See n. 4. There is a difference between calling someone “a god” and “the God.” God called them “gods” not “the true God.”

used essentially in the major premise but is used personally in the minor. The Father is not that one God when the word “God” means the three persons in a common essence.

3. *The word God is the name of a person; therefore, where there are three persons, there are three Gods.* Reply. On the contrary, God as plural (*plurimum*) is the name of the essence.
4. *Then these three persons are substantively (realiter) distinct among themselves and substantively (realiter) among themselves the same.* Reply. They are distinct as to the persons and the same as to essence.
5. *This cannot happen in creatures.* Reply. Just as nothing that is in God can properly exist in the creatures. However, in creatures, one person can have two substances, a soul and body. Why then can one substance in God not have three persons?

Controversy 4 – *Is our Savior Jesus Christ that true, Most High God? We affirm against the Socinians.*⁷

Arguments

1. From the names of God attributed to Him. He is LORD of hosts (Is. 25:9, 47:4, Jer. 23:6), true God (1 Jn. 5:20), and God over all (Rom. 9:5).
2. From His attributes, such as being the beginning and the end, omnipotence (Rev. 1:8), eternity (Mic. 5:2, Jn. 17:5), omnipresence (Mt. 28:20), and omniscience (Jn. 21:17).
3. From His works such as creation (Jn. 1:3, Col. 1:16), conservation (Heb. 1:2-3), raising of the dead (Jn. 5:21), and redemption (Hos. 1:7). Only God is Redeemer (Hos. 13:4), and “He does everything that the Father does” (Jn. 5:19).
4. From the honor and worship of God given to Him such as adoration (Heb. 1:6, Jn. 5:23), faith in Him (Jn. 14:1), and baptism (Mt. 28:19).

Objections

All objections are taken from Christ’s human nature, mediatorial office, and generation, such as:

1. *The Father is God, Head, and the Father of Christ and greater than Him; but Christ is His servant, priest, mediator, anointed, tempted,*

⁷ “Socinus contra Wiek., c. 5 says, ‘we do say and concede that Christ is the natural Son of God.’ But these words are only devised to make a disguise because they only ascribe to Christ a precarious (*precarium*) and dependent divinity merely in relation to His preeminence, authority, dominion, and office,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 36.

- dead, etc.* Reply. According to His human nature and mediatorial offices, as man in relation to his body He is earthly, visible, corruptible, etc. but in relation to his soul is not.
2. *He can do nothing of Himself (Jn. 5:19).* Reply. As if He had been separated from the Father, for it is added, “For whatever He does, the Son does also” because they are only one God.
 3. *He is the firstborn of creation (Col. 1:15).* Reply. Firstborn means generated from eternity, before all creatures.
 4. *The one begetting should be prior to the one begotten.* Reply. In free generation not in necessary generation.
 5. *He either begat an existing person or one not yet existing.* Reply. Neither, but as coeternal with Him.⁸

§VII. Nothing should be thought here in the manner of creatures, but all things should be thought worthily of God. It is called generation, according to our manner of conception, to the extent that the begotten in creatures is of the same nature as the one who begets and because breathing (*spiratio*) is our life. And so in God, because they are Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, we should think of them as being of the nature and life of God.

§VIII. Concerning the Holy Spirit, five things should be believed:

1. That He is a person.
2. That He is divine.
3. That He is distinct from the Father and the Son (Jn. 14:16).
4. That He proceeds from them both alike (Jn. 15:26).
5. That He is the third in order (1 Jn. 5:7).

Controversy 1 – *Is the Spirit a person?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. He has intellect and will (1 Cor. 2:10-11, 12:11), and He distributes gifts as He wills.
2. The works of a person are attributed to Him. He teaches (Jn. 14:26), leads (Jn. 16:13), moves people from place to place (1 Kings 18:12), and raises the dead (Rom. 8:11).
3. He is distinguished from His gifts as their ultimate author (1 Cor. 12:4, 11; Gal. 5:22).
4. There is sin against Him just as against the Father and the Son (Mt. 12:32, Acts 5:9).
5. He is enumerated as the third person with the Father and the Son (Mt. 28:19, 1 Jn. 5:7).

⁸ See Turretin, *Institutes*, III.xxix.21.

Objections

1. *He is the power of the Most High (Lk. 1:35).* Reply. By Most High, the Spirit Himself is meant. The *power of the Most High* is the power of the Holy Spirit.
2. *Christ would be His Son since He was conceived by the Holy Spirit.* Reply. No, for He is not His Father either on account of the human nature or on account of the divine.

Controversy 2 – *Is the Holy Spirit the true God with the Father and the Son?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. From the names of God which are attributed to the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:3-4, 1 Cor. 3:16-17).
2. From the attributes of God. He is the Most High (Lk. 1:35), eternal (Heb. 9:14), omnipresent (Ps. 139:7), and omniscient (Acts 1:16, 1 Cor. 2:10).
3. From His works of creation (Job 33:4, Lk. 1:35), miracles (Mt. 12:28), raising of the dead (Rom. 8:11), and being the author (*institutionis*) of Scripture (2 Tim. 3:16, cf. 2 Pet. 1:21).
4. From the worship of baptism (Mt. 28:19), prayer (2 Cor. 13:14), obedience (Rev. 2:29), and oaths (Rom. 9:1), and conversely that there is sin against Him (Mt. 12:32, Is. 63:10).

Objections

1. *He is the Spirit of God.* Reply. As Christ is the Son of God when the word “God” is taken personally for the Father.
2. *He is the power of God (Acts 1:8).* Reply. It does not read this way, but rather, “You will receive power, the Holy Spirit.” Therefore, He is God whose power is divine.
3. *He is the finger of God (Lk. 11:20).* Reply. The finger of God is the finger of the Spirit or sign of His power.
4. *He did not yet exist (Jn. 7:39).* Reply. He was not yet working in such a way.
5. *He is sent and given.* Reply. For a particular work, just as God also gives Himself to us (Jn. 14:23).
6. *He examines God (1 Cor. 2:10).* Reply. As God does the heart (Rom. 8:27). In other words, He knows completely.⁹

⁹ “To examine’ in this verse does not mean to investigate but ‘to intimately interpenetrate (*intimè penetrando*),” Turretin, *Compendium*, 38.

7. *He prays for us (Rom. 8:26).* Reply. This means that He teaches us and makes us pray.
8. *He hears and receives from another (Jn. 16:13-14).* Reply. Just as another person testifies that Jesus is the Christ. There are three that testify in heaven: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and these three are one (1 Jn. 5:7).

Chapter 5

God's Decree

§I. The acts of God can be divided in relation to their objects. They have reference either to God Himself—such as *generation, spiration, knowledge, and love of Himself*; or to creatures. The actions that have reference to creatures are either eternal, such as *the decrees*, or temporal, such as *creation*.

§II. God's decree is the definite decision of God establishing from eternity whether something will or will not happen (Acts 2:23; 4:28).

§III. There are five chief attributes of the decrees. The decrees are:

1. Free;
2. Eternal;
3. Absolute;
4. Immutable;
5. And the first cause of things (*rerum*).

Controversy 1 – *Is the decree of God an accident in God?* We deny against the Socinians and Arminians.¹

Arguments

1. God creates by His essence and therefore much more decrees by it (Isa. 44:24).
2. Love is not an accident in God but God Himself; therefore, so is the decree (1 John 4:8).
3. If it were an accident, either it would exist as a created thing, which cannot exist in God; or it would be an uncreated thing, and nothing is uncreated except God.
4. If it were an accident, God would act by something distinct from Himself.

¹ “Socinus and Vorstius want the decrees of God to be in God by inhesion and accidentally that they might overthrow the simplicity of God and establish a real composition in God,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 39.

Objections

1. *The essence of God is one in number, but the decrees are many.*
Reply. The decrees are many with respect to the things decreed, but the decreeing act is only one.
2. *God's essence is necessary, but the decrees are free.* Reply. The decreeing act is necessary, but establishing one thing or another by it is free.
3. *The decrees are contradictory.* Reply. The decreed decisions [*sententiae*] are indeed opposed to one another, such as creating the world and reducing it to nothing, but the act is only one.
4. *God's essence is independent, but the decrees depend upon the will.*
Reply. To establish those decisions depends on the will, but the act of decreeing is the will itself.

Controversy 2 – *Are all the decrees of God eternal, and are none made in time?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.²

Arguments

1. God's decrees are called internal thoughts of God (Ps. 33:11; Is. 14:24), but these are eternal.
2. Election, or the decree concerning the salvation of persons with the means thereunto, is eternal; therefore, the decrees concerning creation, government, permission of the fall, and restoration are eternal also (Eph. 1:4-5, 3:11; 1 Pet. 1:20; Matt. 25:34; Is. 37:26).
3. Whatever He does in time He does according to His eternal foreknowledge and counsel; therefore, all these decrees are eternal (Acts 15:18; Eph. 1:11).
4. If a new decree could be formed in time, then an event could become future in time which God could not have foreknown or predicted.

Objections

1. *Certain decrees are said to be eternal in a distinct way (Eph. 1:4).*
Reply. They are called eternal but not in opposition to other decrees.
2. *Then God would not now have anything to decree.* Reply. Yes. Just as today He does not think or learn anything new.

² "The Socinians teach that not all decrees are eternal but that some are temporal, of which many are made in time according to the relation demanded by the things themselves in order that they might more easily prove that the decrees differ substantively from God," Turretin, *Compendium*, 39.

§IV. God's decrees are called absolute:

1. Insofar as they are determined and certain decisions not desires of a mind in suspense or not yet completely determined;
2. Insofar as they do not depend on any preceding condition;
3. Insofar as God does not will to hinder them or cause them to cease to exist.

Controversy 1 – *Are the decrees of God decisions that are still pending (sententiae adhuc pendentes) and not yet determined?* We deny against the Jesuits.³

Arguments

1. They are called the determined counsel and decision of God (Acts 2:23; Is. 25:1).
2. Nothing would be future on the basis of a pending decision, it would begin [*inciperet*] [in time] contrary to Ps. 33:11, Is. 14:27.
3. God could no more have decreed anything by a pending decision than He could be said not to have decreed contrary to Is. 37:26.
4. Another part of His decision would necessarily have to be changed contrary to Job 42:2.

Controversy 2 – *Do any of the decrees of God depend upon a condition to be performed by the creature?* We deny against the Socinians and Arminians.⁴

Arguments

1. God does all things on account of Himself, and nothing depends on the creature (Prov. 16:4; Rom. 11:35-36).
2. The creature cannot do anything unless God has decreed it (Acts 2:23); therefore, the act of the creature follows the decree and hence cannot be the cause of the decree.
3. Those decrees would be pending decisions [*sententiae pendentes*] contrary to what has been said.

³ On middle knowledge, see Chap. 3, pp. 38-39. Note that in Turretin, *Compendium*, the parallel controversy reads, "Are there conditional or conditioned decrees?"

⁴ "The adversaries devise conditional decrees that they might establish free will and the fabrication of middle knowledge," Turretin, *Compendium*, 40.

Objection

1. “*If you believe, you will be saved*” (Mark 16:16). Reply. This statement does not contain the form of a decree but of a moral decision (*sententiae moralis*)⁵ in which it is explained that God will also give salvation to the one to whom He will give faith.

Controversy 3 – *Are the decrees of God rightly distinguished into determinative or efficacious and non-determinative or non-efficacious decrees?* We deny against the Arminians.⁶

Arguments

1. Because every decree of God is efficacious and fulfilled (Ps. 33:11, Job 42:2, Eccl. 3:14).
2. God’s will cannot be resisted (Rom. 9:19; Is. 14:27).
3. It would be useless for God to desire or determine what He sees will not come about.

Objections

1. *Those whom God had first decreed to lead into Canaan, He afterwards did not want to lead into Canaan (Num. 14:23).* Reply. On the contrary, He led in those whom He had decreed to lead in.
2. *They rejected the counsel of God (Lk. 7:30).* Reply. The counsel in this text is the institution and commandment of baptism.

§V. God’s decrees, in relation to the things decreed, are threefold, just as we said concerning the will of God:⁷

1. They are *effectual* in relation to something to be brought about (Eph. 1:11);
2. They are *moral* in relation to something to be commanded (Eph. 1:9);
3. They are *permissive* in relation to sin to be permitted (Acts 4:27-28).

§VI. God did not by any means decree to bring about everything He commanded, for then innumerable decrees would be voided every day. And although He commands all men to be holy and to fulfill the law, He

⁵ See §V below.

⁶ See Chap. 3, pp. 40-41.

⁷ Cf. Chap. 3, p. 39.

has not decreed to save all by the law. But He only decreed to bring about (*efficere*) the good moral and natural things that actually occur.

Controversy 1 – *Has God also absolutely determined future contingent events by His decree?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.

Arguments

1. The Scripture expressly says that God decreed what Herod and Pilate did freely (Acts 2:23-24, 4:27-28; see also Is. 14:26).
2. He determined how many, when, and where people would be born (Acts 17:26), but these things are contingent.
3. He also decreed everything that was freely inflicted on Christ (Matt. 27:35; Jn. 19:24, 36-37).
4. He governs and effects contingent events in time (Prov. 16:33; 2 Sam. 12:12); therefore, He decreed them (Eph. 1:11).

Objections

1. *Freedom is taken away.* Reply. That which is given through creation is also preserved through providence.
2. *The use of prayer is taken away.* Reply. No more in us than in Christ (Matt. 26:42). The conclusion is, “Your will be done.”

Controversy 2 – *Has God ordained for each individual person a fixed and certain end of their life by His decree?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.⁸

Arguments

1. The number of months and days have been determined (Job 14:5; Ps. 39:4-5; Acts 17:26).
2. A sparrow does not fall to the ground or a hair from our head except by the will and purpose of God (Matt. 10:29-30); therefore, much less does man die without God’s will (Ps. 90:3).
3. God works all things according to the counsel of His will (Acts 15:18, Eph. 1:11); therefore, He also does this when He takes away someone’s life (Ps. 104:29).

⁸ “This question is provoked by the Socinians and Arminians. They deny that the end of our life is fixed and determined by the providence of God in such a way that it cannot be increased or shortened that they might assert the mutability of the decrees,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 41.

4. God would not know when the godly would be received into heaven and the ungodly punished in death unless He had established a fixed end to each life.

Objections

1. *Long life is promised* (Exod. 20:12). Reply. Long life, but not longer than the appointed time.
2. *They do not live out half their days* (Ps. 55:23). Reply. This means that they do not die after a full life. This refers to the betrayer Judas and other similar enemies of Christ.
3. *Fifteen years were added to Hezekiah's life* (Is. 38:1, 5). Reply. To the years which he had at that time not to his appointed end.
4. *Why should you die before your time?* (Eccl. 7:17). Reply. Not before the time determined by God, but the time of death that someone who had brought sickness and death on himself by intemperance might expect from his own nature.
5. *The use of means is taken away.* Reply. Not at all, for God has commanded means and grants no one faith without the use of means (Heb. 11:6).

Chapter 6

Predestination

§I. Thus far we have considered the decrees in general. We now consider the decree of predestination.

§II. Predestination is the decree of the Triune God concerning the final end or state of rational creatures as well as the necessary means for that end (Rom. 8:29).

§III. And although it is only one act, one may consider in it:

1. The selection of the persons,
2. The destination to an end,
3. And the destination to the means (1 Thess. 5:9).

§IV. The final end is only the glory of God in the demonstration of mercy and justice (Rom. 9:22-23), but the means are creation, permission of the fall, giving of a Mediator to some, etc. (Rom. 11:7, 32).

§V. And although in God's eternity, there is nothing before or after, yet paying careful attention to the nature and order of things, we distinguish the *intended end*, as that which precedes, from *the decree of execution*, which follows it (Rom. 9:22-23).

§VI. From this the rule has arisen, "That which is first in intention is the last in execution and vice versa." This has place in *the end*, collated with all the means presupposed in conjunction with it, but it does not have a place in collating *one of the means with another*. For example, because sin follows creation in execution, it does not necessarily imply that it was before it in intention.

§VII. When the intention of the end is considered as the first act of God, there can be no other object than a possible creature. But by looking back on the decree in its execution, we may rightly say that God has not decreed to confer that end except on someone created and fallen.

§VIII. In the predestination which concerns angels, there is a passing over, concerning which, see 1 Tim. 5:21 and Jude 6. We distinguish the predestination which concerns men into election and reprobation.

SIX. Election is not *an act of mercy* but a destination of certain ones to a demonstration of mercy, nor is reprobation *an act of justice* but a destination of certain ones to justice, which the Lord performs according to His authority and power (Rom. 9:22).

SX. We posit five attributes of this predestination:

1. That it concerns particular individual men.
2. That it is eternal.
3. That it has no other cause than the good pleasure (*benepiacitum*) of God.
4. That it is to the end and to the means.
5. That it is unchangeable.

Controversy 1 over attribute 1 – *Is there a predestination of individual men or an election of particular men and reprobation of others?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.

Arguments

1. Certain names have been written in the book of life (Lk. 10:20, Phil. 4:3). Certain names have not (Rev. 17:8), which have been written for judgment (Jude 4).
2. Many are called but few are chosen (Mt. 20:16), known to God (2 Tim. 2:19), and given to Christ (Jn. 17:9).
3. Individuals are enumerated: Jacob and Esau (Rom. 9:11), Pharaoh (9:17), Judas (Jn. 13:18), and Paul (Acts 9:15).
4. The reservation of individuals is according to election as it was in the time of Elijah (Rom. 11:4-5, 7).

Objections

1. *Christ is prepared to have mercy on all.* Reply. Who convert, but those who convert are the elect.
2. *It is unjust to give a sentence concerning the works of men before the works have been done.* Reply. The sentence is only given at the judgment (Heb. 9:27).

Controversy 2 over attribute 1 – *Is predestination, then, only a general decree (“I will save those who believe and condemn unbelievers”) without any determination of individuals?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. Because by such a decree no one is destined to salvation nor is anything established concerning anyone; consequently, by this

decree nothing would be made future, and all things remain possible.

2. The decree of God is also foreknowledge (Acts 2:23, Rom. 8:29), but from this decree, no foreknowledge can be attained.
3. From this decree neither infants nor Gentiles can be judged, nor could Adam if He had not sinned.
4. By this decree no one is given to Christ; thus, granted this election, everyone could perish, and Christ would have come in vain.

Objection

1. *If you believe, you will be saved.* Reply. This is the rule of the Gospel not the statement of a decree.

Controversy over attribute 2 – *Are election and reprobation eternal decrees of God?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. They are described in the Word of God in this way: that they are an eternal decree (Eph. 3:11); before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4) and the times of the ages (2 Tim. 1:9); now once (Jude 4); and before the faith (Jn. 10:16) and life (Rom. 9:11) of man.
2. Every decree of God is eternal (Eph. 1:11).

Objections

1. *How can God exhort reprobates to godliness?* Reply. Because it is a good work and everyone's duty.
2. *If this is granted, they could do their duty and yet not be able to be saved.* Reply. They could be saved, for "whoever will believe and be baptized will be saved" (Mk. 16:16).

Controversy 1 over attribute 3 – *Is Christ the meritorious cause of our election?* We deny against the Arminians, Papists, and Lutherans.¹

Arguments

1. Christ has been destined and given for the elect not for electing; therefore... (John 3:16, 17:6).
2. Because Christ from the decree of God is the means of execution not the cause of the intention (Eph. 1:5, 1 Thes. 5:9).

¹ "Christ is the foundation of the execution of election *à posteriori*, but He is not the cause of decreeing election *à priori*," Turretin, *Compendium*, 45.

3. Election is free and has no cause (Rom. 9:16, 18).
4. Then it would be in the power of Christ as Mediator to ordain for a particular person the kingdom of heaven contrary to Mt. 20:23.
5. Christ was not able to merit that which could not be promised to Him, but election, insofar as it is an eternal decree, cannot be promised.

Objections

1. *He chose us in Christ (Eph. 1:4).* Reply. This means He chose us to be saved through Christ.
2. *Christ reconciled us to God.* Reply. In time, when He made us friends of God.
3. *Then Christ has been elected on account of us.* Reply. Just as He came on account of us so, that is, that He might save us (1 Thes. 5:9).

Controversy 2 over attribute 3 – *Is sin the meritorious or moving cause of reprobation insofar as it is a decree of God?* We deny against the Arminians and others.²

Arguments

1. Reprobation is an act of free authority (*potestatis*), “He hardens whom He wants to harden. He makes one to honor or dishonor as He wants” (Rom. 9:18, 21).
2. Nothing good or evil was considered in them (Rom. 9:11).
3. Then there would be no place for the objection, “Then God is unjust.” Nor would there be the good reply, “He does this according to His authority (*potestate*)” (Rom. 9:19).
4. Nor should it be said, “You do not believe because you are not elect,” but “You are not elect because you do not believe,” contrary to Jn. 10:26.
5. No decree of God admits a cause outside of God.

Objections

1. *God condemns on account of sin; therefore, He also decreed to condemn on account of sin.* Reply. That is, He decreed future damnation on account of sin, but sin is not therefore the cause of

² “Why has He reprobated this one rather than that one, when both were equally sinners and therefore reprobable? It cannot be sin because it is common to both, and no other cause can be given other than the good pleasure of God, because He wanted it to be this way,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 48.

this decree, which concerns the means; and therefore much less is sin the cause of that decree which concerns the end.

2. *God only hates a sinner.* Reply. If “hates” means to destine to a demonstration of justice, then this statement is contradicted by Paul (Rom. 9:11, 13), but if “hates” means to detest and punish, it is conceded.
3. *Reprobation is punishment.* Reply. No, it is an eternal decree.

Controversy 3 over attribute 3 – *Does God elect someone on the basis of foreseen faith and perseverance in godliness and reprobate someone else on account of foreseen unbelief and perseverance in it?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. It is not of him who wills nor of him who runs (Rom. 9:16) and not of works (11:5).
2. It is of the mere good pleasure of God (Mt. 11:26, Eph. 1:5).
3. It is a free act of God, “He has mercy on whom He wills” (Rom. 9:18, 21), and He is not free to reject him who perseveres in godliness.
4. It is before faith (Rom. 9:11) and unto faith (Eph. 1:4).
5. It is out of the same mass (Rom. 9:11, 21).

Objections

1. *He chose us in Christ.* Reply. Not existing in Christ but to be saved through Christ.
2. *Without faith it is impossible to please God (Heb. 11:6).* Reply. This means it is impossible to accomplish anything that pleases God.
3. *The Father loves you because you love Me (Jn. 16:27).* Reply. This love is the love of friendship, such as that among friends, it is not the love of eternal benevolence.
4. *We are saved through faith; therefore, He decreed to save through it.* Reply. He decreed that it would be in that order, such that a man would be saved through faith.

Controversy 4 over attribute 3 – *Is, then, the first decree of God toward possible men the demonstration of mercy in some and justice in others?* We affirm against the same.³

³ “The views of theologians can be referred to three orders [of decrees]. Some ascend above the fall, from whence they are called supralapsarians, who think that the object of predestination is man not yet created or at least not yet fallen. Others descend inside the fall and think that the objects of predestination are men not only fallen but also redeemed through Christ or as believing and unbelieving. Others holding a middle position remain at the fall and think that fallen men are the object of predestination,”

Arguments

1. It is the decree concerning the end, but this decree is the first of all.
2. It is the last in execution; therefore, it is the first in intention.
3. He either created men unto this end or unto no eternal end, or He changed his decree.
4. He has been created unto an end (Is. 43:21), “for this purpose He raised them up” (Rom. 9:17). “He makes a vessel for honor” (Rom. 9:21). “He makes all things for Himself” (Prov. 16:4).

Objections

1. *Then men are created for destruction.* Reply. No, but for a demonstration of justice. Creation and damnation are means, but that demonstration of justice does not have a place in the means, “That which is last in execution is first in intention.”
2. *A possible man is not a being.* Reply. Then, no decree of the end concerning possible things could exist, but God would have to first determine creation and then its goal. Or, if there can be such, why not this one as well?
3. *How can they be said to be vessels of mercy and wrath?* Reply. For no other reason than that they have been destined to mercy and wrath (Rom. 9:22).
4. *They are chosen to be saved through Christ and therefore as those who are in misery.* Reply. This pertains to the means and is after the intention of the end, for the *elect* are given to Christ the Mediator to be saved.
5. *They are chosen out of the world.* Reply. When they are actually (*actu*) set apart.

Controversy over attribute 4 – *Did God also decree to give the grace of conversion and faith to certain men and to not give it to others?* We affirm against the Arminians and Socinians.

Turretin, *Compendium*, 44. Rijssen holds to the first viewpoint. The Arminians and others hold to the second. Turretin holds to the third position (see *Institutes*, IV:ix). It is noteworthy that while Rijssen held to a supralapsarian position, he presented Turretin’s views on the question accurately in the *Compendium* and even has Turretin refuting some of the arguments that he makes in this work. As Turretin himself says, those who hold the first and third position maintain the saving foundation of the faith against the errors of the Pelagians (Turretin, *Compendium*, 44). For a helpful summary of the debate, see Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 157-62. Note also that Heppe cites the *Compendium* in that passage but refers it to Rijssen when it is actually the words of Turretin that are used. See “Introduction,” pp. 1-1ii.

Arguments

1. God chose certain people to sanctification; therefore, He decreed to make them holy (Eph. 1:4, 2:10, 2 Thess. 2:13, 1 Pet. 1:2).
2. "It is not of him who wills nor of him who runs but of God who shows mercy. God hardens whom He wills"; therefore, He decreed to have mercy on one and to harden another.
3. Some have been chosen that they might bear fruit (Jn. 15:16). Others have been ordained for this: that they might stumble (1 Pet. 2:8, Jude 4).
4. Since some have grace from God and others do not, it is necessary that He decreed to give grace to some and not to others (1 Cor. 4:7, Acts 11:17).

Objections

1. *He commands all to believe.* Reply. He only sets forth what we must do in order to be saved.
2. *Then He does not act seriously with the reprobate.* Reply. Seriously. For He does not tell them seriously what He decreed concerning them but what their duty is.

Controversy over attribute 5 – *Is election immutable so that an elect person cannot become reprobate and vice versa?* We affirm against the Arminians.

Arguments

1. Firmness and immutability are expressly attributed to predestination (Heb. 6:17, 2 Tim. 2:19).
2. Such is the malice of Satan that all the elect would perish unless it was impossible (Mt. 24:24).
3. Nothing can happen outside of the decree and foreknowledge of God (Eph. 1:11); therefore, those whose names have been written in the book of life cannot perish (Lk. 10:20).

Objections

1. *Lest I become a reprobate (1 Cor. 9:27).* Reply. Lest men disapprove of me and accuse me of having an immoral life.
2. *We should make our election sure (2 Pet. 1:10).* Reply. This means that we should make ourselves certain of it.
3. *"I will delete him from the book of life" (Ex. 32:33).* Reply. This means: "I will deprive him of life." 2. The word is hypothetical,

- from which we can only conclude a connection between the subject and the predicate like, "If I lied, I would be like you" (Jn. 8:55).
4. *God is able to graft them in (Rom. 11:23).* Reply. Not reprobates but a people from the Jews, among whom He does have His elect.
 5. "*We work that we might be godly.*" Reply. It is a necessary means to salvation.

§XI. Among the means of reprobation it is not necessary to establish either subordination or coordination. It suffices to say that God decreed the end to be carried out in this order: first, to create man; then, to permit the fall; next, to leave them in that fall; and finally, to condemn them on account of their sins.

Chapter 7

Creation

§I. Thus far the eternal acts of God have been discussed. We now treat of those acts that occur in time. They pertain either to *nature*, such as creation and governing, or to *grace*, such as the sending of Christ, redemption, justification, etc.

§II. Creation is the production of something out of nothing (Rom. 4:17, Heb. 11:3) or from unfitting material and material of a different nature (Gen. 1:27).

Controversy – *Can only God create? Have creatures not created? And are they unable to create?* We affirm against the Socinians and certain Papists.¹

Arguments

1. God claims it for Himself alone (Job 9:8, Is. 44:24, Jer. 10:11-12).
2. It is a work of omnipotence (Is. 40:26, Rom. 1:20).
3. The creature can neither make nor destroy the heavens (Job 38:31ff.) or increase stature (Mt. 6:27).
4. No creature can rule over something that does not exist or command them to come into being.

Objections

1. *All things have been made through Christ (Jn. 1:3).* Reply.
“Through” does not denote an instrumental cause but the principal cause as in Rom. 11:36.

§III. God created all things in or with the beginning of time (Gen. 1:1).

¹ “Certain teachers of the Papists want the power to create to be communicable to the creature for the purpose of contending for the dogma of transubstantiation together with wickedly calling the sacrificers the creators of their creator. But the purpose of the Socinians is to remove our arguments for the divinity of Christ from His works of creation,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 52.

Controversy – *Could the world have existed from eternity?* We deny against certain Papists.

Arguments

1. God creates all things according to the counsel of His will (Eph. 1:11, Rev. 4:11); therefore, it is necessary for a creature to exist after His counsel and be created at a set time.
2. Everything that is created has an origin to its essence and therefore also of its duration because duration follows the nature of the essence; but duration without a beginning cannot be created.
3. All that is created has successive duration, because to have total possession of life at once belongs to God alone. But something that has succession cannot be from eternity, for where there is not a beginning, there cannot be a second, third, etc.²
4. If something could be created from eternity, then the same thing could be reduced to nothing from eternity. For in every moment of existence, except the first, a creature can be reduced to nothing; therefore, it could both exist and not exist from eternity.

Objections

1. *God has the power to create from eternity.* Reply. He has the power to create in and with time.
2. *He was able to make eternal and free decrees.* Reply. Decrees are not created beings that exist outside of God.³

§IV. God created this universe from nothing or no material at all (Gen. 1:1).

Controversy – *Did God create this world out of nothing or from no preexisting material, or did He create from some eternal and invisible material?* We deny the latter and affirm the former against the Socinians.⁴

² See Chap. 3, pp. 34-35.

³ See Chap. 3, p. 33 and Chap. 5, pp. 52-53.

⁴ “This is to be observed against the Socinians who hold that there is no mention of the material itself in the six days in Moses that they might more easily disprove the argument that we take from it for asserting the divinity of Christ from before the creation of the world,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 53.

Arguments

1. God created all things which are seen and not seen (Eph. 3:9, Col. 1:16, Rev. 4:11, Rom. 11:36); therefore, there is no uncreated material.
2. God is said to have existed before He made the beginning of the dust of this world (*orbis*) (Prov. 8:26, Ps. 90:2); therefore, there was nothing.
3. Those things that have been made have not been made out of what appears or those things that now appear to exist; therefore, He made it out of nothing (Heb. 11:3, Rom. 4:17).
4. In six days God created the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all things in them (Ex. 20:11, Gen. 2:1); therefore, nothing existed which He did not create, and if He created all things, it is necessary for Him to have created it out of nothing.
5. Nothing is or can be uncreated except God.

Objections

1. *“Eternal hills” (Gen. 49:26)*. Reply. These are hills that existed for ages and will exist for many ages more (Ps. 90:2), but they are not eternal.
2. *The world was without form (Gen. 1:2). That chaos was eternal*. Reply. All these things are expressly said to have been created.

§V. In the work of creation it is often asked, on what day were the angels created? Reply. It is not necessary to define it, but they seem to have been created on the first day (Job 38:6-7).

Controversy – *Did the angels exist and were they created a long time before the creation of the world?* We deny against the Socinians and Arians.⁵

Arguments

1. God created the world in six days and therefore the angels as well (Ex. 20:11, Gen. 2:1).
2. “Before those days were” and “to be from eternity” are equivalent in Holy Scripture (Ps. 90:2, Prov. 8:34ff., Jn. 17:5).

⁵ “Not a few of the ancient Fathers held that the angels were created before the beginning in Moses. But the Socinians want the angels to exist before the Mosaic beginning, or at least that they could exist before it, in order to break down the eternity of Christ and thus His divinity, which we prove from His existence before the world,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 55.

3. The hosts of heaven were created at that time (Gen. 1:1, 2:1; Col. 1:16), but these are angels (1 Kings 22:19).

Objections

1. *Moses passed over the creation of the angels.* Reply. It is included under the name of the “host of heaven.”
2. *They could not have fallen so quickly.* Reply. It is the same with man.

§VI. Angels are created and complete spiritual substances gifted with intellect, will, and power.⁶

§VII. The knowledge of the angels is threefold:

1. Natural, which God created in and with them (2 Sam. 14:20).
2. Revealed (1 Pet. 1:12).
3. From experience (1 Cor. 2:9, Lk. 15:10).

Controversy – *Do angels know our thoughts and the condition of our hearts?* We deny against the Papists.⁷

Arguments

1. God alone knows the hearts of men (1 K. 8:39, Jer. 17:10, Rev. 2:23).
2. Besides God no one knows what is in man except the spirit within him (1 Cor. 2:11).

Objections

1. *Their angels see the face of God (Mt. 18:10).* Reply. They are ready to serve God in the salvation of believers (cf. 1 K. 10:8).
2. *Angels rejoice when they see someone’s conversion (Lk. 15:10).* Reply. When someone makes it known to them.

§VIII. There are two kinds of angels: some are good angels, whom God uses for the help of those who are to be saved (Heb. 1:14). Others are

⁶ There seems to be a problem in the arrangement of the paragraphs. I have rearranged them in a more sensible way. Thus, the original paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 become in this translation paragraph 10, 7, 11, 8, and 9 respectively. I have moved the original paragraph 9 to after the last two controversies on angels and the original paragraph 11 to before the last two controversies on angels.

⁷ “The Papists attribute this knowledge also to them that they might establish the invocation of angels,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 56.

evil angels who defected from God by their own fault and fell from their first estate (Jn. 8:44).

§IX. Among evil angels some kind of order is to be established, since the word of God mentions princes of the devils, who perhaps excel the others in evil and power (Mt. 12:24).

§X. The evil angels, who are especially evil persons, do not have terrors of conscience, which is evident from this:

1. Because a unique, astute perversity and treachery is ascribed to them (Eph. 6:11-12, 2 Cor. 2:10-11).
2. Because they tempt men (Gen. 3:13), including Christ (Mt. 4:1); kill (Jn. 8:44); and plot against all (1 Pet. 5:8).
3. Because they are horrified of God (James 2:19) by whom they shall be punished eternally (Mt. 25:41).

Controversy 1 – *Does each person have his own guardian angel, or one evil angel and one good angel?* We deny against the Papists.⁸

Arguments

1. We do not read of this in Scripture, but the angels in general are said to take care of the sons of God (Ps. 34:7, Heb. 1:14).
2. Much less do we read that a good angel is present until death to the wicked and profane (from whom God is far away [Prov. 15:29]).

Objection

1. *“They said, ‘It is his angel’” (Acts 12:15).* Reply. They foolishly imagined to themselves that he was an apparition as in Lk. 24:37.

Cotnroversy 2 – *Are there nine orders of angels: seraphim, cherubim, thrones, dominions, virtues, powers, principalities, archangels, and angels?* We deny against the Papists.⁹

⁸ “The Papists want every believer to be assigned some angel by God from their birth who is their perpetual companion and guardian until death, on which opinion they build the religious worship of angels and the daily worship committed to an angel by name,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 58.

⁹ “That they might more easily contend for the fabrication of the hierarchy of their Church, the Papists have invented another one in heaven of the angels,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 58.

Argument

1. Holy Scripture does not mention these things; rather, it prohibits looking into such things (Col. 2:18).

Objections

1. “*Thrones, principalities*” (Col. 1:16). Reply. There can be various descriptions of angels, such as that they are holy, elect, and blessed.
2. “*With the trumpet of the archangel*” (1 Thes. 4:16). Reply. He is Christ (Rev. 12:7).

§XI. All things have been created in the following way:

1. By the word of God.
2. In a moment.
3. Good.
4. Finite.
5. In six days:
 1. Heaven, earth, and light.
 2. The sky.
 3. Plants.
 4. The heavenly bodies.
 5. Fish and birds.
 6. Beasts of the field and man.

§XII. In heaven, the sun, moon, and stars as well as their substance, the number of the stars, their movement, and their powers of illuminating and making warm and fruitful are worthy of great admiration.

Controversy – *Are the sun and moon moved and made to go around in orbit while the earth remains still?* We affirm against certain philosophers.¹⁰

Arguments

1. The sun is said to be moved in heaven, to rise, and to go down (Ps. 19:5-6, 104:19, 22, Eccl. 1:5-6).
2. It is recounted that by a miracle, the sun remained in its place (Jos. 10:12-13, Hab. 3:11, Job 9:7) and went backwards (Is. 38:8).

¹⁰ This was a significant controversy in the Netherlands as it was in the rest of Europe. On the controversy over the Copernican theory and related issues as well as other bibliography on the subject see John Dillenberger, *Protestant Thought and Natural Science* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 75-103.

3. The earth is said to stand immoveable (Ps. 93:1, 96:10, 104:5, 119:90).
4. Birds, which often fly about in circles for hours, would not be able to go back to their nests, for the earth would have been moved in the meantime 450 of our miles.
5. Whatever flies and remains in the air would seem to be moved from the west to the east, which is known to be false from birds, the flight of arrows, from the particles of the sun, and the cotton seed flying in the air.

Objections

1. *Scripture speaks according to appearance, in other words, according to what seems to be.* Reply. As it seems to be, so it is in reality (Mt. 5:18).
2. *Birds, air, and all things are moved with the earth.* Reply. These are fabrications. Air is a fluid body. 2. By what force can birds be moved from the east to the west?

§XIII. Man consists of a body made of earth and a spiritual soul (Gen. 2:7). Objection. *Paul adds "spirit" (1 Thes. 5:23).* Reply. The spirit means mind or intellect, and the soul means will.

Controversy – *Are souls generated from parents, or is it created by God alone?* We deny the former and affirm the latter against the Lutherans.¹¹

Arguments

1. The souls of Adam and Eve were not made out of the earth but created (Gen. 2:7).
2. The power to create souls is attributed to God alone (Eccl. 12:7, Is. 57:16, Zech. 12:1, Heb. 12:9) but never to man.
3. What is generated is liable to corruption and perishes with the perishing body (1 Cor. 15:42, 53; Mt. 10:18).
4. The souls of parents would be divided and another soul would be put together from parts, which is false.

¹¹ "Whereas Lutheran dogmatics in the doctrine of the origin of man's soul (almost completely) defends traducianism and rejects creationism, by the Reformed (apart from individual older Church teachers) traducianism as well as pre-existence is rejected," Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 227.

Objections

1. *“Souls came from the loins of Jacob” (Gen. 46:26).* Reply. Souls mean men, as in v. 22. 2. The Hebrew word for soul also refers to a dead body (Lev. 19:28).
2. *How could man generate man if he does not generate the soul?* Reply. As a man kills a man, although not the soul.
3. *He either creates pure or impure.* Reply. He creates the soul but not the purity in man.

§XIV. Man was created in the image of God, wise, holy, immortal, blessed, etc.

Controversy – *Was man truly created with the qualities of wisdom, righteousness, and immortality?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹²

Arguments

1. Man was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26), and this phrase always includes moral virtues (Gen. 5:1, 1 Cor. 15:49, 2 Cor. 3:18).
2. Eve showed in the very temptation by Satan knowledge of God, the law, her state, and her holiness (Gen. 3:2-3).
3. God made man very good and righteous (Gen. 1:31, Eccl. 7:29), but moral goodness is extremely necessary for man (Heb. 12:14).
4. When man sinned, he lost these things; therefore, he had them before (Rom. 3:23, 5:19) and in regeneration receives them back (Col. 3:10, Eph. 4:24).

Objections

1. *Righteousness is established through continual actions.* Reply. Not that which is infused (Lk. 1:35).
2. *He would not be able to fall.* Reply. He was changeable like the angels (Jn. 8:44).
3. *Man is also said to have been created in the image of God after the fall (Gen. 9:6, James 3:9).* Reply. In relation to the first state of Adam and restitution in Christ.

¹² “The Socinians deny that man was created in wisdom and righteousness that they might more easily avoid the truth of original sin. They indeed confess that man was created without the corruption that he now has, but they deny that man was created without mistrust and rebellion of reason and appetite,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 61.

4. *They did not know that they were naked.* Reply. They did not know that they had a shameful nakedness that had defiled the soul and body.

§XV. Things are said to be immortal:

1. From themselves, such as God.
2. In themselves, such as angels and souls.
3. By the favor of God, such as man was in paradise, although changeably.
4. Unchangeably, in heaven.

Controversy – *Was man truly immortal before the fall so that he neither would have died nor could die unless he sinned?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹³

Arguments

1. Death is wretched (Rom. 7:24) and an enemy (1 Cor. 15:26), but there cannot be misery in that place (*illic*).
2. God had established the penalty of death only for sin (Gen. 2:17); therefore, death could not have been inflicted without sin.
3. The devil, a murderer, is the author of death (Jn. 8:44), but he cannot inflict any harm except through sin.
4. The power of death is sin (1 Cor. 15:56, Job 24:19); therefore, where there is no sin, death cannot reign (Rom. 5:12, Rom. 6:23).

Objections

1. *He was dust.* Reply. Yes, and in heaven he will be dust in relation to the origin of the flesh not in relation to weakness.
2. *He was able to eat food.* Reply. As a means prescribed and instituted by God.
3. *He was given the responsibility of producing children.* Reply. Since God wanted this in order to fill the earth. *Additional objection.* *Immortals will not enter into marriage (Lk. 20:35-36).* Reply. Immortals in that mode of existence.

§XVI. Theologians consider the image of God in man to consist in these things:

¹³ “The Socinians do not want to acknowledge the immortality of the first man, which should be the consequence of righteousness, and they hold that death was something that followed nature and not the wages of sin, so that man would die even if he had not sinned. The goal is that they might overthrow original sin...and deny the satisfaction of Christ for us,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 62.

1. *Antecedently* in the spiritual nature,
2. *Formally* in holiness,
3. And *consequently* in dominion.

But the first and last are found in a certain way in demons and the damned. Hence, it is rather to be said that men in these ways are like God but to refer *image* to holiness.

§XVII. This image can be said to be natural to man, not as if it were an essential part of the nature but:

1. Because it was created with nature,
2. Because it was not contrary to it,
3. It was necessary for the end (*finem*) of created man,
4. And because it was to be propagated with nature just as now its vestiges are.

Controversy – *Was that holiness supernaturally in man as a harness by which natural desires (cupiditates) for evil are restrained?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. God made man very good and consequently not with desire for evil (Gen. 1:31, Eccl. 7:29).
2. Evil concupiscence is not from God (1 Jn. 2:16).

Objections

1. *Man was dust.* Reply. So was Christ, but in Him there was no love of evil or appetite incompatible with the spirit just as there was not in Adam.
2. *Otherwise, how could the flesh rebel against the spirit?* Reply. Flesh, that is, the corrupt nature, was not in them; therefore, it did not rebel against the spirit, but man was deceived.
3. *Natural things have been lost by the fall, but righteousness is lost...* Reply. Natural things, which constitute the essence of man, have not been lost but only those that constitute moral rectitude.

Controversy – *Did man before the fall have the same virtues that exist today in the regenerate who believe in Christ?* We affirm against the Arminians.¹⁴

¹⁴ The Arminians hold that Adam did not have the power to believe in Christ and thus did not lose it in the fall, and “so God cannot now demand faith in the Gospel from us unless He first gives us sufficient grace for that, since no one is held to the impossible,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 63.

Arguments

1. Man was wise, holy, without any fault and defect, but many of these things are not required for someone to be able to believe.
2. Those who are regenerated today do not immediately receive as much as Adam had.
3. The gifts of sanctification, which those who are regenerated receive, were lost in Adam (Eph. 4:24); therefore, Adam had them.

Objections

1. *That ability would be useless.* Reply. Not at all, since by that same ability he believed in and adhered to God.
2. *The Gospel could not be revealed to him.* Reply. Thus, he was not able to see or hear the Messiah; however, there were ears and eyes quite capable of doing this.

Chapter 8

God's Providence

§I. Divine providence means the administration of the world by which God observes, preserves, works (*operatur*), and rules the world and all things in it (Heb. 1:3, 4:13, Acts 17:25, 28).

§II. The rule (*norma*) of every act of providence is the decree. He governs all things so that they arrive at their decreed ends (Eph. 1:11).

§III. Therefore, it is necessary for this providence of God to include all things:

1. Concerning the heavens (Is. 40:12, 26),
2. Angels (Heb. 1:14),
3. Men (1 Tim. 4:10),
4. Animals (Ps. 104:27),
5. Plants (Mt. 6:28),
6. And contingent events (Prov. 16:33).

§IV. And this is necessary so that no creature should be independent of God or God be dependent on them contrary to Rom. 11:36.

§V. God in His providence toward the creatures does these things:

1. He preserves them in their nature, life, and power (Neh. 9:6).
2. He established for them the laws and order of nature (Jer. 33:20).
3. He determines their places, times, birth, and death (Acts 17:26).
4. He gives the knowledge and impulse for observing the appointed order (Jer. 8:7).
5. He works all good things in them (Rom. 11:36).
6. He directs them to their ends (Prov. 21:1).

§VI. These actions, just as all the actions of God, must necessarily be omnipotent, holy, wise, independent, etc.

Controversy – *Does the providence of God also rule the smallest things?*
We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.¹

¹ “The occasion of this question arises from those who seem to acknowledge a certain providence of God, but they enclose it in stricter limits than it has and refer it

Arguments

1. From the birds (Mt. 6:26), lilies (v. 28), sparrows (Mt. 10:29-30), the ox (1 Cor. 9:9), and snow (Ps. 147:16).
2. It is said that He works all things (Rom. 11:36, Eph. 1:11).
3. Unless He governed all things, He would not be able to foresee or foretell all things contrary to Rom. 15:18, Is. 46:10.

Objections

1. *It is too demeaning to God.* Reply. No more than to create the smallest things.

§VII. This providence of God is distinguished into:

1. *Real*, by which he governs creatures by an influx of His power (Is. 45:7)
2. *Moral*, by which He governs rational creatures by laws (Mic. 6:8),
3. And *permissive*, by which He permits the evil of sin (Acts 14:16).

Controversy 1 – *Does God effect and determine those things that occur by chance and accident?* We affirm against the Socinians, Arminians, and Papists.²

Arguments

1. God says that He Himself determines these things (Ex. 21:13, Prov. 16:33, Amos 3:6, Job 39:3).
2. Unless they were determined, we could not cast our cares on God or have confidence in Him in these matters contrary to Ps. 4:8, 37:5; Jas. 4:15.
3. Unless He determined them, it would not be necessary to pray to God that things might turn out well and to give thanks to Him when they did turn out well contrary to Neh. 1:11, 2 Sam. 3:9, Ps. 65:10, Jer. 5:24.
4. All things in the world would be uncertain to God and man.

only to great matters and exclude lesser ones...Some of the Scholastics desire this, especially Thomas," Turretin, *Compendium*, 66.

² "The old and new Pelagians exclude contingent and chance events from the providence of God and thus make men free but also irreligious," Turretin, *Compendium*, 66.

Objections

1. *Then nothing is by chance.* Reply. Chance only has a place in second causes.
2. *Then prudence would not deserve to be praised nor imprudence to be rebuked.* Reply. Not as a first cause but as a virtue or vice in a second cause.

Controversy 2 – *Did God also determine those things which creatures do freely?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. He directs wills how He wants (Prov. 21:1, Ps. 33:15, Acts 17:28, 1 Sam. 10:26).
2. The saints pray that God might change their will and effect good in them (Ps. 86:11, 119:36, Lam. 5:21, Heb. 13:21, 1 Kings 8:58).
3. He promises that He will turn the heart to good (Jer. 32:39-40, Ez. 36:26-27), and the glory for all godliness is given to Him (Phil. 2:13).

Objections

1. *“Man rules his heart” (Prov 16:1).* Reply. As a second cause.
2. *The cause is free, and when all things are posited that are requisite for acting, he can act or not act.* Reply. No, but he does do what he pleases.
3. *Then how can man act freely?* Reply. Not as a first cause but as a second cause dependent on God.
4. *This introduces fate.* Reply. Not a Stoic fate binding God, but a Christian fate subjecting the creature to God.
5. *Then what good are admonitions and threats?* Reply. They are means which God uses to motivate the will of the rational creature as they act with reason.

Controversy 3 – *Can God fail in His purpose?* We deny against the Arminians.

Arguments

1. None of His thoughts can be rescinded (Job 42:2).
2. It is misery for a goal and a hope to be cut off (Job 8:13, Lam. 3:18), but God is blessed.
3. No one is stronger or wiser than God (1 Cor. 10:22); therefore, no one can frustrate God.

4. All things work according to the counsel of His will (Eph. 1:11, Acts 15:18); therefore, His purpose never fails.

Objection

1. *They rejected the counsel of God (Lk. 7:30)*. Reply. The institution of baptism.
2. *God did something in vain (Jer. 2:30)*. Reply. In relation to our duty not the intention of God.

§VIII. God works through means:

1. So that sometimes means flow into (*influant*) effects (Ps. 104:13).
2. He sometimes raises the means above their natural powers (1 K. 19:5).
3. Sometimes means do nothing, but God acts in the presence of means as in miracles (Acts 3:12).

On this basis, providence is commonly said to be mediate or immediate and ordinary or extraordinary.

§IX. A miracle is a unique work of God outside of His ordinary providence and above the powers of creatures for the confirmation of divine truth (Ps. 22:18, Mk. 16:20).

§X. Men in miracles do nothing except pray to God, speak to or touch someone, or do something similar, but by their own power they produce no effect at all (Acts 3:12, Ps. 72:18).

§XI. The real providence of God is always joined with the moral and permitting, when any good or evil work of the creature occurs.

§XII. God by His providence toward evil does these things:

1. He orders (2 Sam. 16:10ff.);
2. Works the natural act (Acts 17:28);
3. Permits evil (Acts 14:16);
4. Limits (Job 1:12);
5. And directs it to a good end (Gen. 50:20).

Controversy – *Does God by His providence so rule and ordain evil that when He permits it, it certainly comes to pass?* We affirm against the Socinians, Arminians, and Papists.

Arguments

1. He is expressly said to procure it, call it forth, and make it so that it comes to pass (Gen. 45:8, 2 Sam. 12:11, 16:10, Acts 4:28).

2. Otherwise it could not be predicted.
3. And when the creature acted, they would be first and independent causes.

Objections

1. *Then God is the cause of sin.* Reply. We deny the consequent. The cause of sin is in that which turns aside from the law.
2. *Then he cannot punish evil.* Reply. He can because the creature does what he wants.

Chapter 9

The Law, the Fall, and Sin

§I. The word law, taken most broadly, is a rule of action.

§II. In relation to the subjects, some laws have been given to all creatures such as to be subjected to God, to preserve nature, and to be moved and to remain still (Ps. 148:6). Others have only been given to certain creatures such as to beasts, men, or angels.

§III. The law that has been given to man is a rule by which God commands him to act rightly and forbids him to do wrong (Mic. 6:8).

§IV. Certain laws have been given to man insofar as he is an animal, such as that he is to maintain life, generate after his own kind, and feed his children; and others have been given to him insofar as he uses reason, such as that he is to worship God.

§V. There are four actions of law:

1. It declares what should be done (Ps. 119:104ff.).
2. It obligates (Rom. 7:1).
3. It motivates (*excitat*) (Ps. 19:11).
4. It judges (Jn. 7:51), either by acquitting or condemning (Rom. 2:12).

§VI. The law has been given to man in three ways:

1. It has been written on the heart,
2. Proclaimed by the mouth,
3. And expressed in writing.

The law written on the heart is often called the natural law (Rom. 2:14-15).

Controversy – *Did Adam, besides the commandment not to eat the fruit, have the whole moral law written on his heart?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹

¹ In Turretin, *Compendium*, this question is the same as “Is there a natural law?” (p. 72). He lists the opponents as being the Socinians and the Libertines. In the *Institutes*, Turretin says that this is a debate with the Libertines who think that

Arguments

1. Because he was created wise and holy, as proved before.²
2. His conscience taught him that God should be believed and obeyed and death avoided (Gen. 3:3).
3. After the fall, the law remained written on his heart (Rom. 2:15); therefore, it was written there before the fall.

§VII. Man had to fulfill that law with perfection of parts, degrees, and times, that is, he always had to fulfill the whole law with all his strength (*viribus inditis*) (Mt. 22:37).

§VIII. That law becomes a covenant (*foedus*), when a pact (*pactum*) and agreement (*conventio*) is added in which God obligates Himself to give a reward to such obedience (Gal. 3:12).

§IX. Such a covenant was entered into with Adam in which:

1. He was constituted the head of every man except Christ,
2. Obedience was commanded to him in the name of all,
3. A reward was promised,
4. A threat of death was added,
5. And all these things were approved by man (Hos. 6:7).

§X. The reward was eternal and blessed life in heaven, which was promised according to liberality and not according to the dignity of the work.

*Controversy – Did man before the fall have the promises of a blessed life and the glory of heaven? We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.*³

righteousness and honesty depend only on human will and arise from the consent of human society and that it is to be measured by its utility for each individual (XI:i.5-6).

² See Chap. 7, pp. 73-74.

³ “The Socinians assert that the first man was mortal and that death was not the punishment of sin but the consequence of nature. They contend that the covenant of God with Adam was not spiritual but only concerning a benefit of animal and earthly life.” This was also the view of Amyraut who posited a threefold covenant (the natural, legal, and the evangelical) and others said that it was only the evangelical covenant that had the promise of eternal life, Turretin, *Compendium*, 73.

Arguments

1. The covenant of God, “Do this and live,” only had a place before the fall and in the case of Christ, but it means, “you will live forever” (Gal. 3:12, 21).
2. The death denounced to man includes eternal death under the dominion of the devil, as we may conclude from Gen. 3:13 and 1 Cor. 15:22; therefore, the promised life was eternal life.
3. The law has only been weakened through sin so that it cannot save (*salvare*) (Rom. 8:3); therefore, before sin it was able to save (*salvare*).
4. He had the tree of life, and the thing that it signified was eternal life (Rev. 2:7).

§XI. In that state, man did not yet have a right to life but he did have the power of acquiring it.

Controversy – *Is God able not only to deprive an innocent creature of life but also to condemn them to the eternal tortures of hell?* We deny against certain Scholastics.

Arguments

1. All the ways of God should be mercy and truth to those who keep covenant (Ps. 25:10).
2. Anyone approaching God should believe that He will reward their obedience with a reward not condemn them (Heb. 11:6).
3. In an innocent creature there can be no consciousness of guilt or the just judgment of God, which is the meaning of punishment.
4. No glory to God could arise from this but rather the dishonor of a tyrannical lord.
5. The righteousness of God demands that He acquit the holy, but it does not permit him to condemn someone who has not merited it (Ps. 18:26-27, Gen. 18:25, Ps. 7:11).

Objections

1. *He can reduce the innocent to nothing.* Reply. Then he only takes away what He gave, but punishment would be to do injury to someone while existing.
2. *He acts this way with Christ.* Reply. He was our surety, who took our debts on Himself.
3. *God can impute to us the sin of Adam.* Reply. That is imputed to be ours which is truly ours just as the children of slaves are slaves and the sons of citizens are citizens and are reputed to be such.

4. *We are permitted to kill innocent creatures.* Reply. 1. Not rational ones. 2. Irrational ones (*bruta*) for our use (2 Pet. 2:12). 3. It is one thing to kill, another to give to the living the highest punishment according to one's pleasure.

§XII. Man transgressed this law in this way:

1. The *moral law* by unbelief, pride, and contempt,
2. And the *sacramental law* by eating the forbidden fruit.

§XIII. Concerning this sin, God:

1. Did not persuade them to do it
2. Compel them to do it,
3. Approve of it,
4. Or take away grace that He had given;
5. And consequently, was not the author of it (Job 34:10).

§XIV. Neither did He want it to come to pass by permitting it, if “want (*velle*)” means “to approve or to praise”; nor if “want (*velle*)” means “to determine” did He desire the existence of sin, which has neither essence nor existence; but He “wanted (*voluit*),” or decreed to permit, that man would freely become the cause of sin (Acts 4:28).

§XV. This was, therefore, the first sin. Its *external cause* was the temptation of Satan, and the *internal cause* was the will of man provoked by a vain hope of a better condition (2 Cor. 11:3).

§XVI. This sin was the most serious sin of all not in degree (*gradu*) (Mt. 12:31) but insofar as it was:

1. The sin of a sound (*integrī*) man,
2. Not the sin of him alone but of the whole nature,
3. And the fount and origin of all evils (Rom. 5:12).

§XVII. The fruits of sin are *pollution* (Job 14:4), *guilt* (Rom. 5:16), *slavery to the devil* (Jn. 8:34), *vexation of conscience* (Gen. 3:10), *expulsion from paradise* (Gen. 3:23), *the cursing of the earth* (Gen. 3:17), and *death* (Gen. 3:19), which are a true loss of the divine image.

Controversy 1 – *Did man by sinning lose the image of God and original righteousness?* We affirm against the Socinians and some Arminians.⁴

⁴ “The Socinians deny that the image was in any way lost through the fall, but they contend that it still survives complete. The Arminians indeed confess that Adam merited by his fall that God would take from him that original righteousness. They assert this lest they be compelled to acknowledge that man has lost original righteousness to the point that free will no longer survives,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 75. See below, Chap. 7, pp. 74-76.

Arguments

1. Man by that sin was truly made a sinner and received the image of the devil whose offspring is sin (1 Jn. 3:8).
2. That righteousness and image of God must be restored in us in regeneration; therefore, it has been lost (Eph. 4:24, Col. 3:10).
3. The image of Christ in holiness is expressly contrasted with the image of Adam whose nature we bear (1 Cor. 15:49, Gen. 5:1).
4. Unless we had lost it in this way, we would be by nature sons of God not *of wrath*, and we would not lack ability (*viribus*) to attain the glory of God contrary to Eph. 2:3 and Rom. 3:23.

Objections

1. *Man is also said to have been created in the image of God after the fall (Gen. 9:6, Jas. 3:6).* Reply. In relation to the first creation, restitution in Christ, and the substance of the soul.
2. *The regenerate do not lose righteousness by one act.* Reply. That is by the grace of God in Christ (1 Pet. 1:23).
3. *Then sin should also be expelled by one righteous act.* Reply. As to dominion (1 Jn. 2:29), not as to the remnants (*reliquias*) of sin (Rom. 7:20).
4. *An acquired habit is not lost by one contrary act.* Reply. This is not surprising because it is acquired after the fall by someone prone to sin.⁵

Controversy 2 – *Did man by his action (actu) effectively lose that righteousness?* We affirm against the Arminians.⁶

Arguments

1. Man actually by his action (*actu*) made himself a sinner. God did not (Rom. 5:12, 18-19). Therefore, man deprived himself of holiness.

⁵ In Turretin, *Compendium*, Rijssen lists four reasons why we cannot say that an acquired habit is not lost by one contrary act. 1. This is not universally true at any time. 2. The first sin of Adam is unique. 3. The same thing happened to the angels who sinned as happened to man. 4. The adversaries affirm the opposite in the case of the sin against the Holy Spirit (see p. 75).

⁶ The Arminians admitted that man merited the loss of original righteousness, but they denied that God actually took it away completely so that free will would be lost. The Reformed asserted that Adam's sin actually effected the loss of original righteousness both morally and meritoriously (see Turretin, *Compendium*, 75; *Institutes*, IX:viii).

2. They are expressly opposed: “God made man righteous, but he corrupted himself” (Eccl. 7:29).
3. Unless he by his action (*actu*) deprived himself of that righteousness, it would not be sin to lack it, just as where there is no sin, punishment is not permitted.

Objections

1. *Then God did not do it.* Reply. God certainly did not do it, for He did not take away any grace from man.⁷
2. *Then what is the force of the sentence, “by death you will die”?* Reply. Both the power of sin and its fruit are set forth.
3. *If efficiently, then how is it meritoriously?* Reply. Efficiently, as he loses it for himself and meritoriously as to his posterity.

§XVIII. With this sin committed, the covenant of works was abrogated insofar as it contained a pact and promise (Rom. 8:3); however, it remains, insofar as it is a law, prescribing holiness and prohibiting sin under the penalty of death.

*Controversy – Was man after he sinned obligated not only to punishment because of the first sin but also to perform new obedience to the law and again to punishment, if he sinned? We affirm against the Arminians.*⁸

Arguments

1. The moral law remained written on the heart, which teaches the *law (jus) of God* and that those who go against it *are worthy of death* (Rom. 1:32, 2:14-15).
2. “To fear God and keep His commandments (whether innate or communicated) is the duty of all men” (Eccl. 12:13).
3. Otherwise, unless a new law was made, Adam could not sin, nor could the Gentiles sin because they did not have the law revealed [at Sinai] (*legem latam*)⁹ contrary to Rom. 2:12, 5:13.

⁷ See above §XIII, p. 84.

⁸ “This question arises from the opinion of Cargius that the passive righteousness of Christ alone is imputed to us because the law only obligated sinners to punishment not obedience,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 75. George Cargius was a sixteenth century Lutheran theologian who held that only the passive obedience of Christ was necessary. The following is a summary of Arminius’ view by De Moor from Arminius’ letter to Uytendogaert: “He denies that Christ was bound to perform obedience of the law for us from the hypothesis that when we were constituted in a state of sin, we were only bound to the punishment [of the law but] no longer also to perform obedience,” Bernhardinus De Moor, *Commentarius Perpetuus*, XX:xvii, 3:967.

Objection

1. *No one is obligated at the same time to obedience and to punishment.* Reply. Why not? A citizen is obligated to pay tribute to the Magistrate and to the punishment of the law.

§XIX. The sin arising from the first sin is either original or actual.

§XX. Original sin is that impurity with which man is born.

Controversy – *Is there original sin? Or, is every man except Christ born a sinner?* We affirm against the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Arminians.

Arguments

1. We are born in sin (Ps. 51:5), impure (Job 14:4, 1 Cor. 7:14), flesh (Jn. 3:6), and under sin (Gal. 3:22).
2. Only Christ was free from sin (1 Jn. 3:5) and separated from sinners (Heb. 7:26).
3. But the whole world is liable to condemnation before God (Rom. 3:19, Ps. 143:2).
4. Infants cannot be saved unless they are cleansed from their sins by the blood of Christ (1 Jn. 1:7, Acts 4:12).
5. For that reason, infants also receive baptism, the sacrament of the remission of sins (Gen. 17:10, 14; Acts 2:38-39).

Objections

1. *All sin is voluntary.* Reply. Not even all actual sin is voluntary, much less original sin (Rom. 7:19).
2. *Infants are innocent.* Reply. They are without guile and malice but not without sin.
3. *It is not prohibited by any commandment.* Reply. It is condemned by the whole law, which says, “Be holy.”

§XXI. Original sin is either *imputed* or *inherent*.

§XXII. *Imputed* original sin is the very sin of Adam which is imputed to us. I would prefer to say “that which is reckoned and considered to be our sin,” since we sinned in him.

⁹ *Legem latam* is commonly used to describe the law revealed at Sinai.

Controversy – *Did all men sin in Adam in such a way that this sin should be reckoned as the sin of all?* We affirm against the Socinians, Anabaptists, Arminians, and certain Frenchmen.¹⁰

Arguments

1. All are said to have sinned in him (Rom. 5:12) and through the act of his disobedience to be constituted sinners (v. 19); therefore, they are guilty of the same act.
2. By that one offense all have been made guilty of condemnation (Rom. 5:16, 18), but where there is a mutual participation (*communio*) in guilt (*reatus*), there is a mutual participation in an offense (*culpae*).
3. Unless we had sinned in him, we could not be born deprived of righteousness; for someone else cannot deprive us of righteousness *by his own offense*.
4. We all die spiritually in Adam (1 Cor. 15:22), but only the soul that sins shall die (Ez. 18:4; Rom. 5:12, 15-16); therefore, we sinned in him.
5. All punishments inflicted on Adam and Eve are public (*communes*) (Gen. 3:17); therefore, the sin is common to all as well, for punishment only results from sin (Rom. 5:12).
6. Adam was the moral head of the covenanted (Rom. 5, 1 Cor. 15); therefore, his offense should be considered to be the offense of all.

Objections

1. *God did not impute it to Adam.* Reply. He did not impute, that is, He forgave him just as He does all believers; however, He did impute it, that is, He considered it to be his sin.
2. *The son should not bear the iniquity of the father.* Reply. It is our iniquity, not that of the father alone.
3. *Each one shall carry his own load (Gal. 6:6).* Reply. This load is ours.

¹⁰ “The old Pelagians hold that Adam’s sin harmed only himself and not his posterity. The Socinians expressly deny that all man sinned in Adam. The Anabaptists also deny that the posterity is guilty on account of the fall of the first parents. The Arminians retain the name of a certain imputation but take away the thing itself,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 77. The “certain Frenchmen” refers particularly to Josué de la Place (1595-1655 or 1665) or Placaeus, professor at the Huguenot seminary of Saumur from 1633 until his death. He held that the guilt of Adam’s posterity arose from original corruption that was passed onto them; whereas, the consensus position of the Reformed Orthodox was that the sin of Adam was imputed to all mankind antecedently of the corruption that they received from Adam. He was condemned by the French Reformed Synod of Charenton in 1644, but the Synod of Loudun withdrew the condemnation in 1659.

4. *Why are not the rest of Adam's sins imputed?* Reply. Because when the covenant was broken, he ceased to be the head of the covenanted.
5. *Then his righteousness should also have been imputed.* Reply. On that point, we should have been born pure [*hactenus ut puri nasceremur*].¹¹
6. *God does not punish righteousness with unrighteousness.* Reply. Since that time we are all unrighteous.

§XXXIII. *Inherent* original sin is that sinful disposition by which man is incapable of any good and inclined to all evil (Rom. 3:9, 12).

§XXXIV. Original sin is said to be a positive quality insofar as by it man is truly deprived of a good disposition that should have been in him and is disposed and provoked (*irritatur*) to all evil.

Controversy – *Is human nature after the fall not only deprived of original righteousness but also truly corrupt and inclined to evil?* We affirm against the Pelagians, Socinians, and Arminians.¹²

Arguments

1. All have become corrupt and incapable of any good (Rom. 3:12, 2 Cor. 3:5).
2. Even in the best people, there is flesh fighting against the law of God and the Spirit (Rom. 7:23, Gal. 5:17).
3. Everyone must be born again (Jn. 3:3, 5).

Objections

1. *One act does not lead to a disposition.* Reply. One injury leads to death, and privation of the light leads to darkness.
2. *Infants have done nothing good or evil (Rom. 9:11).* Reply. In act.¹³

¹¹ In this brief statement, the objection to the imputation of Adam's sin seems to be that if his sin was imputed to us, then his righteousness should have been imputed as well. To this, Rijssen responds to those who would limit original sin to passing on the corruption of sin, Rijssen turns the argument around and says that his righteousness would also be passed onto us in the form of purity. Thus, the argument of Rijssen's opponents refutes itself.

¹² "The Papists and others restrict the whole nature of original sin to the mere privation of original righteousness without the addition of any evil qualities," Turretin, *Compendium*, 78.

¹³ They have no actual sin, but they do have original sin.

3. *Infants are innocent (Ps. 106:38)*. Reply. Civilly, insofar as they have committed nothing in the state worthy of death.

Controversy 2 – *Is that inherent original sin truly and properly sin that merits death?* We affirm against the same.¹⁴

Arguments

1. All sin merits death (Rom. 6:23), and there is no sin improperly so-called (1 Jn. 5:17).
2. The whole world is liable to condemnation before God on account of it (Rom. 3:19, Eph. 2:3).
3. This sin is against the divine law and the Spirit (Rom. 7:7, 23, Gal. 5:17).
4. It is an impurity (Jn. 14:4) on account of which man must be regenerated (Jn. 3:3, 5).

Objections

1. *It is not our fault that we are prone to sin*. Reply. It is, insofar as we sinned in Adam.
2. *Infants belong to Christ and are saved (Mt. 19:14)*. Reply. Whoever is saved through Christ has sin (1 Jn. 1:7).

§XXXV. This entire guilt belongs, however, to the totally corrupt man, by which he, although he can do natural, civil, and ecclesiastical good, cannot however do any spiritual good, that is, work salvation (2 Cor. 3:5).

Controversy – *Does man have a free will? That is, do any abilities survive in man after the fall by which he can keep the law of God, do spiritual good, and work salvation?* We deny against the Socinians, Papists, and Arminians.

Arguments

1. Man is dead in sin (Eph. 2:1, 5; Col. 2:13).
2. He is consequently incapable of any good (Rom. 8:7-8, 1 Cor. 2:14, 2 Cor. 3:5).
3. He has to be regenerated (Jn. 3:3, 5; Ez. 36:26ff.; 1 Cor. 12:3).
4. And every power of doing good is given to him by grace (1 Cor. 4:7, Phil. 1:29, 2:13).

¹⁴ Cf. the discussion on concupiscence in Chap. 15, pp. 194-196.

Objections

1. *God requires obedience from man; therefore, he can obey.* Reply. He does not teach what man can do but what he ought to do.
2. *It is placed in their will (Dt. 31:19).* Reply. Not what he can do by nature, but he expounds the way of death and life with a commandment of their duty.
3. *You will rule over sin (Gen. 4:7).* Not sin but Abel as appears from the Hebrew syntax.¹⁵
4. *How can God punish man, if man can do nothing good?* Reply. First, because that impotence has been contracted by our sin in Adam. Second, because it pleases man. Finally, he freely does evil from that impotence.

§XXXVI. A rational spirit remains in man, and a small amount (*rudera*) of the knowledge and consciousness of God remained but no holiness, which was properly the image of God.

Controversy – *Are Gentiles or unregenerate men unable to please God or act rightly?* We affirm against the same.¹⁶

Arguments

1. They are bad trees that cannot bring forth good fruit (Mt. 7:18, 12:33, 1 Jn. 5:19).
2. They do not have Christ or faith, without which no one can do anything good (Jn. 15:5, Heb. 11:6).
3. They are said to be incapable of any good work (Tit. 1:15-16). They cannot please God (Rom. 8:8).
4. Their best works are not approved by God (Prov. 15:8).

Objections

1. *They love their neighbor (Mt. 5:46).* Reply. By a natural and civil love which does not suffice to please God.
2. *“In every nation, God is pleased with everyone who does good” (Acts 10:34).* Reply. There are none of these among the unregenerate.

¹⁵ See Matthew Poole, *Synopsis Criticorum*, 1:col. 53. Some interpret this phrase as meaning that even though Cain’s sacrifice was not accepted, his position as the eldest will not be; therefore, there was no reason for Cain to be angry at Abel.

¹⁶ “The Papists use the example of the Gentiles who had virtues (which they deny to be sins) above others so that they may show that there remains strength in the free will in a state of sin,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 81.

3. *They know the true God and can glorify Him (Rom. 1-2).* Reply. They know that God exists, but they do not know who He is and how He should be worshiped.
4. *They did what right reason taught them.* Reply. Natural reason cannot teach us how we may be able to please God.
5. *They are famous for their virtues.* Reply. Natural and political virtues.

Controversy 2 – *Can unregenerate man dispose himself toward conversion?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. Unregenerate man is in the kingdom of the devil and under his power, and only Christ can conquer the devil (Col. 1:13, Mt. 12:29).
2. Regeneration is a raising of the dead (Eph. 2:5, Col. 2:13), but the dead can do nothing.
3. No one can come to Christ unless they are efficaciously drawn by God (Jn. 6:44, Song of Sol. 1:4).
4. Only God can give man a new heart and spirit (Ez. 36:26).
5. The origin of the good in us is from God not ourselves (Phil. 1:6, 29; Jas. 1:18).

Objections

1. *You are not far from the kingdom of God (Mk. 12:34).* Reply. By confession.
2. *They were cut to the heart (Acts 2:37).* Reply. By the regenerating Spirit (Rom. 8:2).
3. *Why then is the word preached to them?* Reply. If perhaps God wants to use it as the means of their conversion (2 Tim. 2:25) like “Lazarus come forth” (Jn. 11:43).

§XXXVII. Original sin is not propagated through the soul or the body, but a sinner generates a sinner without the moral quality of the image of God just as a citizen begets a citizen and a slave begets a slave (Gen. 5:3).

Controversy 1 – *Was the Virgin Mary born without original sin?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. There can be nothing pure from something impure (Job 14:14).

2. The whole world is liable to condemnation (Rom. 3:19); therefore, Mary was also born in that condition.
3. We are all equal by nature (Rom. 3:9, Eph. 2:3).

Objections

1. *She (Ipsa) will crush the head of the serpent.* Reply. Christ (1 Jn. 3:8).
2. *She is beautiful without spot (Song of Sol. 4:7).* Reply. No. *She* is the Church, cleansed by the blood of Christ.
3. *She is blessed among women (Lk. 1:28).* Reply. Not because she was without sin but because of the unique grace given to her.

Controversy 2 – *Is the concupiscence that remain in the regenerate after baptism truly sin and worthy of death?* We affirm against the Papists.¹⁷

Arguments

1. The Apostle complains about it as a vexing sin (Rom. 7:15, 18-19, 23-24).
2. It fights against the spirit (Gal. 5:17) and God (Rom. 8:7).
3. It ought to be put to death (Col. 3:5, Eph. 4:22), and because of it we must be renewed (Ps. 51:10).
4. It is prohibited by the tenth commandment, and it is from the evil one (1 Jn. 2:16).

Objections

1. *It gives birth to sin (Jas. 1:15).* Reply. Actual sin.
2. *“I do not do it”; therefore, it was not his sin (Rom. 7:17).* Reply. It was not his by approbation but was entirely his by commission.
3. *There is nothing condemnable in the regenerate (Rom. 8:1).* Reply. Then there would also be no actual sin. There is said to be “no condemnation” for those whose sins have been forgiven.
4. *We are regenerated through baptism (1 Cor. 6:11, Tit. 3:6).* Reply. Regeneration takes away the dominion of sin not all remnants of sin.

Controversy 3 – *Is original sin a substance or a positive being?* We deny against Flacius Illyricus.¹⁸

¹⁷ See Chap. 15, pp. 194-195.

¹⁸ “In the previous century, Flacius Illyricus advanced the error that sin corrupted the very essence of man’s soul against his colleague Victor Strigellius, who

Arguments

1. Our whole substance was created by God (Ps. 139:13ff.), but sin was not.
2. Christ assumed our substance but not our sin, and he destroyed sin not the substance of man (1 Jn. 3:5).
3. Our entire substance will be raised to glory, but sin will not (Job 19:26).

Objections

1. *It works.* Reply. As every privation does. He who walks in darkness strikes against something, and thus when a mind destitute of goodness acts, it acts badly.
2. *It fights with the law of God, etc.* Reply. As darkness with light.
3. *It is a heart of stone that is taken away in regeneration.* Reply. It is a metaphor. In regeneration not the heart but the vice of the heart is taken away.

§XXVIII. Actual sin is the aberration of an action from the law (1 Jn. 3:4), which can be committed by the intellect, will, memory, and body.

Controversy – *Are heresies and errors of the mind in matters of religion sind?* We affirm against the Arminians.

Arguments

1. They are rebuked as sins (Tit. 3:10, 2 Jn. 9-10, Heb. 3:10).
2. They are causes of destruction (Jn. 8:24).
3. It is commanded, “Do not wander (*errare*)”; therefore, to wander (*errare*) from the truth is sin (1 Cor. 6:9, 15:33-34, Gal. 6:7, Jas. 1:16).
4. Errors can cause the highest reproach to God (Ps. 94:7-8, Acts 17:29).
5. They are works of the devil, the flesh, and evil men (Eph. 4:14, 1 Thess. 2:14, 1 Tim. 4:1, 2 Tim. 3:13).
6. There would be nothing necessary to correct, if they were not sin.

extolled the role of free will in conversion and downplayed man’s corruption,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 83.

Objections

1. *Men make errors through no fault (culpa) of their own.* Reply. Not every sin requires a preceding fault (*culpam*), as is revealed in Adam.
2. *The works of the Spirit can be in those who err (Gal. 5:22).* Reply.
 1. Is there not also sin in them?
 2. They often have the form but deny the power (2 Tim. 3:5).
3. *Errors are not voluntary.* Reply. They are insofar as they please those who err.

§XXXIX. Actual sin can be distinguished in various ways, for there are sins:

1. Of omission and commission,
2. That are reigning and vexing (*vexans*),
3. From ignorance or from malice,
4. Against God, ourselves, or our neighbor,
5. Or that are forgivable or unforgivable.

Controversy – *Are there venial sins, that is, sins too small to merit death?*
We deny against the Papists and Socinians.¹⁹

Arguments

1. The wages of every sin is death (Rom. 6:23, 5:12, Job 24:19).
2. Every sin is a violation of the law, but he who transgresses in one commandment transgresses in all (Jas. 2:10) and merits a curse (Gal. 3:10).
3. Christ suffered death for all our sins; therefore, they merit death (1 Jn. 1:7, 1 Pet. 3:18).
4. All sins must be remitted; therefore, all sins merit death (Ps. 103:3, 1 Jn. 1:9).
5. The abrogation of the smallest commandment is worthy of condemnation (Mt. 5:19, 12:36).

Objections

1. *It is possible for someone's work to be burned up yet he himself be saved (1 Cor. 3:15).* Reply. He will be saved since his sins have been forgiven.

¹⁹ "The Papists divide sin into mortal and venial. Their goal is to seek support for the perfection of righteousness, works of supererogation, the merit of works, and purgatory," Turretin, *Compendium*, 84.

2. *Only the last sin in Mt. 5:22 is worthy of death.* Reply. The opposite is taught. Namely, the least hatred merits before God what they thought that murder would merit: *judgment, council, and the valley of Gehenna.*
3. *Concupiscence gives birth to sin, and when this is complete it gives birth to death (Jas. 1:15).* Reply. It is one thing to merit death another to beget death. It begets death because it brings it about by that act (1 Jn. 5:17).
4. *You will not get out until you pay the last penny (Mt. 5:26).* Reply. It refers to the judgment of evil men on this earth, not purgatory.

§XXX. But the sin against the Holy Spirit in relation to its object is committed:

1. *Against the person of the Holy Spirit* when the Spirit is called impure and a demon (Mt. 12:24, 31).
2. *Against Christ*, when He is rejected as an impostor (Heb. 10:29).
3. *Against the Gospel*, when it is at first accepted but then later rejected out of hatred (Heb. 6:5).

And someone does this knowingly and willingly against conscience and with hardhearted hatred (Heb. 10:26).

Controversy – *Is the sin against the Holy Spirit unforgivable?* We affirm against the Papists and Socinians.²⁰

Arguments

1. He who sins in this way “will never have forgiveness” (Mk. 3:29, Mt. 12:32).
2. There remains for him no sacrifice for sins (Heb. 10:26).
3. He cannot be led to repentance (Heb. 6:6).
4. It is not permitted to pray for it (1 Jn. 5:16).

Objections

1. *If you forgive someone their sins (Jn. 20:23).* No one has power to forgive this sin.
2. *If the ungodly converts, he will live (Ez. 18:21).* Reply. The one who commits this sin will never convert; therefore, he will die.
3. *God commands conversion to everyone.* Reply. He does not set forth what will happen but what our duty is.

²⁰ “Bellarmine and others want that sin to be not absolutely unforgivable but relatively because it is forgiven with great difficulty,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 86.

4. *Stephen prayed for those who were resisting the Holy Spirit, and Peter exhorted Simon Magus to repent (Acts 7:59, 8:22).* Reply. It is not revealed that they sinned against the Holy Spirit.

§XXI. The punishment of sin is bodily and spiritual and temporal and eternal.

§XXXII. The death of the body is not a consequence of nature but a punishment of sin. We proved this above when we proved the immortality of Adam.²¹

Controversy – *Are the afflictions of believers properly called punishments?* We deny against the Papists and Arminians.²²

Arguments

1. Christ took our punishments (Is. 53:5) and liberated us from every curse (Gal. 3:13, Zeph. 3:15).
2. God afflicts us out of fatherly love, but every punishment is from the hatred of a judge.
3. They must glory and rejoice in afflictions, but they cannot do this if the afflictions are punishments (Rom. 5:3, Jas. 1:2, Heb. 12:5).

Objections

1. *They are called punishments.* Reply. Improperly²³ because they are afflictions.
2. *They are sent because of sin.* Reply. As medicine for diseases, that is, to take them away.
3. *God afflicts them in wrath (Dt. 1:37).* Reply. A fatherly wrath for correcting them not a judicial wrath to destroy them.

Controversy – *Does God sometimes punish sin with sin? In other words, does God, in just judgment on account of previous sin, sometimes make*

²¹ See Chap. 7, p. 74.

²² “The fundamental error (*prōton pseudos*) of the Papists is to hold that punishment remains after the remission of guilt and that believers must still satisfy with punishments properly so-called after guilt is remitted,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 86.

²³ That is, it is not the strict use of the term but the loose use of the term because the same things are punishments in others.

men fall into other sins to punish them and others? We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.²⁴

Arguments

1. Because God gave them over to the lusts of the heart, to impure emotions, etc. (Rom. 1:24, 26, 28, Ps. 81:12).
2. He hardens men and sends powerful delusions (*erroris*) that they might believe a lie (Jn. 12:40, 1 Thess. 2:12).
3. God is most clearly said to bring it about and make it so that men, on account of prior sins, fall into new ones (2 Chron. 25:20; 2 Sam. 12:11, 17:14; Ps. 105:25; Is. 63:17).
4. The hanging of Judas is considered both a sin and a punishment (Acts 1:18-20 with Ps. 69:26, 28).
5. The deprivation of original righteousness in us is punishment and sin.

Objections

1. *God is the author of punishment not sin.* Reply. 1. Not always the author, meaning the executor, for being killed is also a punishment from God. 2. He is the author of the event, because this happens to us as a punishment.
2. *Punishment is involuntary suffering, but sin is a voluntary action.* Reply. Neither is always true (see 2 Cor. 7:11).
3. *Through punishment, sin is brought under control (in ordinem redigitur).* Reply. If the meaning is “corrected,” then it is false. If it means disobedience is punished, then this occurs in every punishment.

²⁴ “The old Pelagians gave occasion for this question, for they denied that sins were a punishment of sin that they might assert a bare and idle permission of God towards sin,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 86.

Chapter 10

The Covenant of Grace

§I. The covenant (*foedus*) of God in general is a pact (*pactum*) by which God promises to man certain good things and requires (*stipulatur*) of him a particular obligation (*officium*).

§II. The good things that He promises pertain partly to this life and partly to eternal blessedness.

§III. Concerning salvation (*salute*) there are two covenants. The first covenant is of *works*, by which unblemished man is promised salvation (*salus*) under the condition of perfect obedience: “Do this and live.” The other covenant is of *grace*, by which the restitution of fallen man is accomplished in Christ (Heb. 7:22).

§IV. Strictly speaking, the contracting parties in the covenant of grace are the *Persons of the Trinity* or the *Father and the Son*. For the Son was constituted mediator from eternity. The Father required (*stipulatus est*) of Him a condition, and gave to Him the promises concerning the salvation of His own, concerning which, see §IX.

§V. Now, that covenant is indeed set forth in time to man, such as to *Adam*, *Abraham*, or the *Jews*, and the promises that have been given to the Mediator are also appointed for them; however, they have not been made either contracting parties in their individual persons or in any other common head. They were the *ones who approved the covenant* and received its promises. It has been ratified in Christ (Gal. 3:17).

§VI. However, the Scripture says that God entered into the covenant with those to whom the promises pertained and for whom they are renewed (Rom. 11:4).

§VII. This covenant has these things in common with the covenant of works:

1. They have both been derived from the goodness of God and His good pleasure (Eph. 1:3).
2. They promise the same glorious blessedness (Rom. 8:3).

3. They will both certainly come to pass (Heb. 6:17).
4. Everything in these covenants is for the glory of God (Eph. 1:6).

§VIII. But it differs from the first:

1. In the *persons* with whom it has been contracted. The former was contracted with the first Adam, and the latter was contracted with the second Adam (Ps. 89:3).
2. In the things *promised*. In the former only glory was promised, but in the latter grace was also promised (Heb. 8:9-10).
3. In the *persons to whom* it was promised. The former promise was for all of Adam's posterity, and the latter was for all of Christ's posterity (1 Cor. 15:22).
4. In its *Mediator*. The former had none, but in the latter, it is Christ (Heb. 7:22).
5. In its *conditions*. The condition of the former was "*if you will obey*," but in the latter, it is only because the Mediator offered His soul for you (Is. 53:10-11).
6. In its *stability*. The former was broken by sin, but the latter promises forgiveness of sins (Ps. 89:29ff.).
7. The former allowed the merit of men, but the latter has that of the Mediator (Rom. 10:4).
8. In *time*. The first was established at the beginning of the world, but the latter was made in eternity (Eph. 1:4).

§IX. This covenant was constituted in eternity:

1. Who would be the Mediator (Prov. 8:23 – "Anointed from eternity").
2. For whom (John 17:9 – "You have given them to Me").
3. By what means and price (Is. 53:11 – "When He will have given His soul").
4. When (Gal. 4:4 – "In the fullness of time").
5. For what outcome (2 Tim. 1:9 – "Grace and salvation were given to us").
6. And it has been accepted by Christ (Ps. 40:7 – "Here I am"), but freely (Phil. 2:6-7).
7. Finally, all things have been agreed upon and ratified (Ps. 2:6, Is. 42:1 – "Delight (*Benepiacitum*)").

§X. And this covenant ratified in this way is called a testament because there is an establishment of heirs (Ps. 2:8), an announcement (*legatio*) of good things (Heb. 6:17), and those things are to be obtained in virtue of the death of the Testator (Mt. 26:28).

§XI. It almost seems unnecessary to warn that the word "testament" sometimes refers to the books, sometimes to the teachings, and

sometimes, most strictly, to the covenant of grace (2 Cor. 3:6, 14; Acts 3:25).

§XII. It is said to be a *testament of doctrine* (doctrinae) because it was explained in one way before Christ's coming and in another way after He was glorified and therefore either *old* or *new* (2 Cor. 3:6, 14).

§XIII. But the *testament, or the covenant of grace*, was administered in the same way then as it is now, namely, by the Word and Spirit (Is. 59:21).

§XIV. That covenant that has been abrogated *by the new* is the covenant of works but not the moral law, which remains *not as a condition of the new covenant to be fulfilled by the heirs* but as a norm of holiness and godliness (Gal. 3:12, Rom. 8:3).

§XV. The Jews can be considered either *as the sons of God* or *as the sons of Abraham*. As sons of God, the same covenant of grace pertains to them. As sons of Abraham, God made with them a special political covenant through Moses (Rom. 9:6ff.; 11:1-2).

§XVI. In this covenant God received them *politically and ecclesiastically* as His people, commanded them to observe the *moral and political law*, and shadowed forth the covenant of grace by certain *ceremonies* (Ex. 19:5).

§XVII. Because this covenant cannot save them or anyone else, the covenant of grace is far better *both considered in itself and in the abrogation of the ceremonies* in its administration (Heb. 7:22).

§XVIII. And although Christ Himself satisfies the covenant of works as a surety, He is only called the *surety of the covenant of grace* because He was constituted a surety in that covenant alone and *not in the political order of the Jews*. As surety, He takes upon Himself the *fulfillment of the covenant of works in our place* that the good things promised in it might be distributed to us (Heb. 7:22).

Controversy 1 – *After the fall, did God enter into the covenant of grace with each and every individual human being?* We deny against the Socinians, Papists, and Arminians.

Arguments

1. The Gentiles are outside of the covenant and people of God; therefore, the covenant has not been entered into with all (Eph. 2:12, Rom. 9:19).
2. The covenant has been entered into with Christ and His seed, but not all belong to Christ (Ps. 89:3-4, 20, 29, Is. 53:11, N.B. All are sinners that the promises might be given to those who believe [Gal. 3:22]).
3. The covenant is “I will give to the dead a new heart,” but this does not happen to all; therefore, the covenant has not been entered into with all (Jer. 31:31).
4. God had not decreed to restore everyone in Christ; therefore, He was not able to promise it to all (Jn. 6:37ff., 17:19).
5. This covenant is everywhere set forth as a particular blessing only given to some (Dt. 7:7, Acts 2:39, Amos 3:2).
6. The covenant is an irrevocable testament by the blood of Christ (Gal. 3:15), which not even sins can break (Ps. 89:30-36); therefore, if it has been entered into with all, then all would be saved (Heb. 6:17).

Objections

1. *All the seed of Eve have been received into the covenant (Gen. 3:15).* Reply. The seed of the woman is Christ; therefore, it is entered into with those who are Christ's. “Your seed,” that is, the devil's seed, is excluded (Mt. 23:33).
2. *After the flood it was entered into with everyone (Gen. 9:11).* Reply. There “covenant” is only a promise that the earth was not going to be destroyed by water, but Canaan was excluded from the covenant of grace (v. 25).
3. *“That He might have mercy on all” (Rom. 11:32).* Reply. This means that no one can be saved except through His mercy (Gal. 3:22).

Controversy 2 – If we assume the establishment of such a universal covenant, does God give sufficient grace to each and every individual by which they may be saved? We deny against the same.¹

¹ “The preceding question refers to objective and external sufficient grace. This question refers to subjective and internal grace,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 91.

Arguments

1. Many do not have the Gospel; therefore, they do not have sufficient grace (Rom. 10:14, Ps. 147:19-20, Mt. 10:5).
2. To many it is not given to be able to believe (Mt. 11:25, 13:11; Jn. 6:65).
3. Many are hardened and therefore “not able to believe” (Jn. 12:39ff.; Rom. 9:18, 11:8; 2 Thess. 2:11-12).
4. They sit in darkness and in the shadow of death (Mt. 4:15, Acts 17:30).
5. The unregenerate cannot please God (Rom. 8:7-8).
6. Otherwise everyone could have the hope of salvation contrary to Eph. 2:12.

Objections

1. *Everyone has the knowledge of God (Rom. 1:20).* Reply. As Creator, not Redeemer.
2. *They must be inexcusable (Ibid.).* Reply. They are, because they did not worship Him as Creator.
3. *“The goodness of God leads everyone to conversion” (Rom. 2:4).* Reply. Men should make use of the goodness of God to that end, but they do not.
4. *“Behold, I stand at the door and knock” (Rev. 3:20).* Reply. He knocks by the word but unless the Spirit opens the door, no one can be converted (Acts 16:14).

Controversy 3 – *Can no one be saved without the knowledge of Christ the Mediator?* We affirm against the same.²

Arguments

1. Christ neither justifies nor saves except by knowledge of Him (Is. 53:11, Jn. 17:3).
2. There is no salvation without faith in Christ (Jn. 8:24, Mk. 16:16) and no faith without knowledge (Rom. 10:14).
3. Christ only dwells in our hearts through faith (Eph. 3:12, 17), and there is no salvation unless he dwells there (1 Jn. 5:12).
4. As a branch outside of a tree, so no one can do anything outside of Christ but must die (Jn. 15:5-6). But the Gentiles who are ignorant of Christ are outside of Him (Eph. 2:12).
5. There is no conversion without knowledge of this truth (Acts 26:18, 2 Tim. 2:25-26) and therefore no salvation (Acts 4:12).

² See Chap. 1, pp. 4-5.

Objections

1. *Faith in Christ was not necessary before the coming of Christ (Heb. 11).* Reply. It was (Heb. 13:8), but in Heb. 11, it refers to the many wonderful things that have been brought about by faith. It does not say that there is saving faith without knowledge of the Messiah.
2. *Rahab was a harlot (v. 31).* Reply. When she did not believe in the Messiah to come, but she accepted the Jewish religion and married a Jew (Mt. 1:5).
3. *Ninevah believed in God (Jon. 3:5).* Reply. The demons also believe and fear (Jas. 2:19). Someone can depart from wickedness out of terror and fear of punishment and live honestly civilly (*politicè*).
4. *They will come from the east and sit (Mt. 7:11).* Reply. When they believe (v. 10).
5. *Cornelius was a Gentile (Acts 10:1).* Reply. He was living among the Jews and knew the Jewish religion and the story of Christ (vv. 37-38).
6. *They can do good works (Rom. 2:14).* Reply. They do materially good things (*bona*) but not rightly (*bene*) or by faith.

Controversy – *Does the revelation of the Gospel depend on the good use of natural gifts; or if man does what he can by nature, will God grant him further grace and the revelation of the Gospel?* We deny against the Pelagians, Jesuits, and the Arminians.³

Arguments

1. Calling and regeneration are not according to the works that we have done (2 Tim. 1:9, Tit. 3:4-5, Rom. 11:5-6).
2. It is not of those who will nor of those who run but of God who shows mercy (Rom. 9:16, 24, 10:20).
3. God began a good work in us, not we in ourselves (Phil. 1:6, 1 Cor. 4:7).
4. Man is by nature dead in sin (Eph. 2:5), and there cannot be any good thing whatsoever in him unless God grants him conversion (2 Tim. 2:25).
5. Then it could not be said, “Who has first given to Him that He should repay?” (Rom. 11:35).

³ “The adversaries distinguish between sufficient mediate and immediate revelation as if the Gentiles who could not have a sufficient immediate revelation had however a sufficient mediate revelation, insofar as they suppose that if someone would use properly the light of nature, God would add to it the light of grace,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 92.

6. The wisest of the Greek and Roman philosophers have not been called but an idolatrous Abraham, Rahab, a thief, and Paul were (Mt. 11:25).

Objections

1. *God is good toward all His works (Ps. 145:9).* Reply. He bountifully gives to all natural blessings not the blessings of grace.
2. *He wants all to come to a knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4).* Reply. To everyone to whom the word is preached insofar as He commands them to acknowledge the truth.
3. *To the one who has it will be given (Mt. 13:12).* Reply. Not to the one who has nature but who has the grace of election and regeneration.
4. *He promises faith to the one who thirsts (Mt. 11:28).* Reply. No. He promises rest to the one who believes.
5. *In Acts, when the conversion of Cornelius, Lydia, and Justus occurred, it mentions that they were religious and feared God.* Reply. Then, their conversion was only a leading of converts to an acknowledgment of the person of Christ. Besides, people are often called “religious” according to their profession alone (Acts 13:50).
6. *Those who abuse gifts are punished.* Reply. Rightly, since they sin, but they cannot for that reason make use of the gifts to please God and merit a new revelation.

Controversy – *In the covenant of grace does God truly promise those things that the law requires in us such as true conversion, faith, and perseverance?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. He promises a new spirit and heart by which we will not turn away from Him (Ez. 36:26, Jer. 32:39-40).
2. The new covenant promises the restitution of fallen man and abolition of the power of the devil in us (Gen. 3:15); therefore...
3. In the new covenant, God also says to fallen man, “I will be your God” (Heb. 8:10), and it is certainly required that He give grace and glory for this to be the case.
4. Unless they were promised in the new covenant, the sacraments of the new covenant could not seal them contrary to Mt. 26:28, Col. 2:11-12.
5. If the new covenant only promised glory and not grace, then the old covenant would be better contrary to Heb. 7:22 and 8:8, for the old covenant also promised glory.

Objections

1. *It is useless to require men to repent and believe in the Gospel if these things are promised.* Reply. The law that has been given to man demands faith and repentance. The Gospel says, “I will give you what the law demands.”
2. *A condition is not a condition when he who prescribed it effects the condition in the one to whom He prescribed it.* Reply. No condition remains for man to fulfill in his own strength, but the condition is from the law and a promise of the covenant.

§XIX. Question. Are faith and repentance not therefore conditions of the new covenant? Reply. 1. They are conditions, meaning demands, that the law, *commanding all holiness*, requires in us. 2. They are conditions *in relation to glory* in that such things are required in someone before he is taken to glory.

But, 1. They are not conditions that are prerequisite in man before the covenant is concluded with him or considered established with him. 2. They are not simply conditions demanded from men and not promised. 3. Nor are they strictly-speaking conditions of the covenant of grace insofar as it is a covenant of grace, but they are conditions of the law that still remains under that covenant. This is clear from Gen. 3:15 in which no condition, fulfillment, or prescription was given, the covenant was considered ratified.

Controversy 1 – *Is, then, the covenant of grace conditional, that is, is it dependent on any condition to be fulfilled by the covenanted?* We deny against the same.⁴

Arguments

1. The covenant of grace has been concluded with Christ, from whom alone the condition has been required and by whom alone it has been fulfilled (Is. 53:11).
2. If it were conditional, then “Do this and live” would have a place in this covenant (Rom. 10:5-6), for a condition would be demanded of

⁴ “The adversaries...suppose that the covenant of grace is also entered into with those to whom God only wants to demand but not effect in them the annexed condition. We hold that among others things, this is the distinction between the covenant of grace and the legal covenant, although conceding that the covenant of grace can be said to be conditioned in a certain sense. The legal covenant promises life under the condition that He demands from men and did not effect, but the covenant of grace promises life under the condition of faith, which He demands from man and effects in him,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 93.

us in the same way that keeping the whole law is demanded from us.

3. Then this covenant would be the same in form as the covenant of works contrary to Hebrew 8:8ff., for the same condition is established and the same reward promised.
4. And merit by the covenant (*ex pacto*) would be admitted, for Adam also would not have fulfilled the law except by the grace of God.
5. No performance of a condition could have been expected from a dead man, and it would be ridiculous to make this covenant, “If you come back to life, I will give you life.”
6. That which promises absolutely every condition is not conditional: *life, faith, constancy, and glory*; but the covenant of grace does this (Jer. 32:40).

Objections

1. *Then it is not a covenant since God stipulates no condition.* Reply. Strictly speaking, it is a covenant in relation to Christ who fulfills the condition, but in relation to us it is a covenant of promises.
2. *Whoever believes will be saved.* Reply. By this, faith is indeed established as a prerequisite of glory, but this is not the form of a covenant.
3. *All the promises of salvation are conditional, such as, “If you want to enter into life, obey the commandments.” Bellarmine enumerates these passages in On Justification, Book 4, chap. 2.* Reply. From these passages, it is only proved that these things are required in man before he can be saved, which we understand, but they do not prove that those conditions themselves have not been promised to man by God in the covenant of grace or that they are not given by Him.

Controversy 2 – *Is this, then, the whole covenant of God with fallen men: that those who believe and persevere in faith will be saved?* We deny against the same.

1. This refers to no man specifically, but the covenant of grace certainly does (Ps. 89:3, 28).
2. This plainly introduces merit, for a reward is owed to the one who fulfills the condition (Rom. 4:4).
3. This covenant would not only be a covenant of *grace* and *life* but one of *wrath* and *death*. The other part would be, “If you do not believe, then you will be damned.”
4. If we assume such a covenant, it could happen that no one would be saved; then the covenant would to that degree be dissolved, and Christ would have come in vain contrary to Jer. 31:32.

5. The covenant of grace is a testament (Heb. 9:15), but such a covenant would not be, because there is no establishment of heirs contrary to Heb. 6:17 and Jn. 17:9, 24.

Objection

1. *He sent the Son into the world that all who believe in Him might have everlasting life (Jn. 3:16).* Reply. He sent the Son that men through faith might be saved.

Controversy 3 – *Were the fathers of the Old Testament participants of the same covenant, and did they have the same spiritual promises? We deny against the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Arminians.*⁵

Arguments

1. Theirs were the covenants, the promises, and the adoption (Rom. 9:4).
2. The law does not destroy the covenant of grace and its promises and therefore they will remain (Gal. 3:17).
3. The Gentiles are distinguished from the Jews because they were strangers and aliens from the covenant of grace (Eph. 2:12), but the Jews were not.
4. The covenant with Levi was life and peace, and they were given to him that he might fear Him (Mal. 2:4-5).
5. The same Gospel was preached to them (Heb. 4:2, 1 Pet. 4:6).
6. And God was to them a God of full salvation after death (Ps. 68:20).
7. And the same promises have been made to them. “Blessed are all who believe in Him” (Ps. 2:12). They will have remission of sins (Ps. 130:7-8) and eternal life (Ps. 73:24, Prov. 15:24), and they will be resurrected (Dan. 12:2).

Objections

1. *“Before faith came” (Gal. 3:23).* Reply. “Faith” means the thing believed, Christ.

⁵ “It is not asked whether the covenant of grace varies as to accidents and diverse dispensations...nor is it asked whether the Old Testament Fathers were saved...for many of our adversaries do not seek to deny this. [But the question is whether] they looked to Christ and were saved in the hope of His coming,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 93.

2. *“Christ first preached salvation” (Heb. 2:3).* Reply. That it is to be obtained by His blood. The same thing is to be replied to 2 Tim. 1:10.
3. *The law has only a shadow (Heb. 10:1).* Reply. The ceremonial law. But besides that, the Jews also had the moral law and the covenant of grace.
4. *The new covenant is better and founded on better promises (Heb. 8:6).* Reply. Than the ceremonial and political law established with the Jews, for which cause it is also said to be *another* and *new*.
5. *The Gospel was hid to the rulers of the age (Rom. 16:25, Heb. 9:8).* Reply. Obviously, to the Gentiles, but it was explained to the Jews under the shadow of the ceremonies.
6. *They did not receive the promises (Heb. 11:39).* Reply. The thing promised, Christ.
7. *How could the Sadducees deny eternal life?* Reply. Because they were blind leaders of the blind.
8. *Then the state of the Jews was better than ours, since they also had bodily promises.* Reply. Not so. The ceremonial law has been abrogated. The Messiah came. The Gentiles are adopted, the truth is revealed, and all things are ours.

Chapter 11

Christ

§I. The Mediator of this covenant was promised in the beginning, afterwards represented by types, and then, in the year 3,955, He came.

Controversy 1 – *Has the promised Messiah already come?* We affirm against the Jews.

Arguments

1. All things are now past that had to be happening when the Messiah was to come: the state of the Jews (Gen. 49:10), Jerusalem and Bethlehem (Mc. 5:2), of the seed of David (Is. 11:1), and the second temple (Hag. 2:10).
2. The seventy weeks of Daniel elapsed long ago, with whatever view we take of their point of departure.
3. Sacrifices and ceremonies ceased a long time ago, but this was to happen only after the Messiah came.
4. The Gentiles would be led to a knowledge of God, His Word, and the promise of the Messiah only after the Messiah (Is. 11:10), but this happened a long time ago.
5. Now I am coming shortly (Mal. 3:1). But this was written many centuries ago.

Objections

1. *Elijah has not yet come.* Reply. He came, but they did not know Him (Mt. 17:12).
2. *The wolf is not lying down with the lamb (Is. 11:6).* Reply. This means that such enemies were reconciled in Christ, for the Messiah did not come to convert beasts (Mt. 4:6).
3. *“There was no war” (Is. 2:4).* Reply. A spiritual peace amongst the members of the Messiah.

Controversy 2 – *Is Jesus Christ the true, promised Messiah?* We affirm against the Jews.

Arguments

- All things predicted concerning the Messiah correspond to Him.
1. He was to be from the tribe of Judah and the house of David, and He was (Ez. 34:23-24).
 2. He was to be born of a virgin, and He was (Is. 7:14, Mt. 1:23).
 3. He was to be Immanuel, and He was (Is. 9:5, 1 Tim. 3:16).
 4. He was to be born in Bethlehem, and He was (Mc. 5:2, Lk. 2:7).
 5. He was poor and despised (Is. 53:3, Zech. 9:9).
 6. He was to be hated, affixed to a cross, and killed (Ps. 22:16ff., Dan. 9:26).
 7. But He was to be a king and remain such forever, and He was and is (Ps. 2:6, Rev. 17:14).
 8. And therefore, He was to rise from the dead (Ps. 16:10, 1 Cor. 15:4).
 9. He was to ascend into heaven (Ps. 68:18, Acts 1:9).
- Thus, these and all things have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

Objection

1. *The Messiah should make war with Gog and Magog (Ez. 38).* Reply. This is never said, but such war is to be waged at times on the people of God like the war that was waged under Antiochus, and another war should be expected (Rev. 20:8).
2. *The Messiah was to establish a third temple (Ez. 40).* Reply. That is, the Church.

Controversy 3 – *Would Jesus Christ have been made man and come into the world if men had not sinned?* We deny against the Socinians and Scholastics.¹

Arguments

1. He was only promised after the fall (Gen. 3:15), and He could not have been born of a virgin except in virtue of the promise.
2. Those who are well have no need of a physician (Mt. 9:13). He only came to save sinners (2 Tim. 1:15).
3. He has been sent on the basis of the love of God toward fallen man (Jn. 3:16), which could not exist in that case.²

¹ “This question opposes the old Scholastics such as Alensis, Occam, Bonaventure, and others; Osiander, who brought this up in the previous century; and the new Socinians. They all assert this doctrine rashly and without the authorization of Scripture. The Socinians’ purpose is to seek protection and support for their most destructive heresy of the metaphorical redemption of Christ and improper satisfaction,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 98.

4. It would not have been necessary for God to be man; therefore, He would have come in vain.
5. Nor would humanity have had any obligation (*obligatio*) to Him as incarnate.

Objections

1. *Christ is the firstborn of all creatures (Col. 1:15).* Reply. “Firstborn” means generated from eternity before all creatures.
2. *In all things, He is preeminent (primus) (v. 19).* Reply. In dignity and position.
3. *All things have been created in Him (meaning “on account of Him”).* Reply. All things have been created on account of Him as God not as man.
4. *Then we have not been made on account of Christ, but He was made on account of us.* Reply. Yes, as man. *Objection. Then we should be given thanks since it is on account of us.* Reply. That’s ridiculous.

§II. In that Messiah, three things ought to be considered:

1. His person,
2. His offices,
3. His states.

§III. The person is the second person of the Trinity, *the Son* (Gal. 4:4), but why *the Son* was made the Mediator and not the Father or the Holy Spirit should not be inquired into and, if inquired into, not decided.

§IV. He is not called the Son on account of His *conception by the Holy Spirit, separation unto an office, resurrection from the dead, or sitting at the right hand of the Father*; but because from eternity He shares in the same substance of the Father and is from the Father, which is a characteristic (*proprium*) of a son among men.

Controversy – *Is Jesus Christ the natural Son of God because He was generated from eternity from the Father by a communication of the nature and not called “Son” on account of His conception by the Holy Spirit or anything else?* We affirm against the Socinians.

² That is, He would not have had compassion on fallen man, if man had not fallen. This compassion and love for fallen man is given as the reason for the Father sending the Son.

Arguments

1. He is the eternal Son of God (Prov. 8:22), to whom it has also been said in an eternal decree, “You are my Son. Today I have begotten you” (Ps. 2:7).
2. He is God’s own (*proprius*) Son (Rom. 8:32), but he who has not been generated from His substance is only more loosely speaking (*improprius*) a son.
3. He is the one and only begotten Son, and the only one who has been generated from the Father (Jn. 1:18, 3:6); therefore, He is the Son of God on account of a true essential communication, not on account of certain gifts that are also common to men and angels (Heb. 1:3).
4. And so He is the Son of the Father, and on account of that very thing, He is equal to Him (Jn. 5:18, 10:30). “Exact impression of His substance” (Heb. 1:3).
5. He humbled and emptied Himself, so that He would be a holy man, subjected to the law (Phil. 2:7-8), but this would not be true unless before His birth He had a greater, divine glory and was God and the Son.

Objections

1. *Then God has generated another God distinct from Himself.* Reply. No, since He did not generate another essence but communicated to the Son the same numerical essence.
2. *Then the Son generated Himself and is at the same time the Son and the Father, since He is the same God.* Reply. He is another person, and He who generates and He who has been generated are distinct in this way.
3. *Everything that is generated did not exist at some time.* Reply. Among creatures, to whom it is natural to have a beginning, but this is not the case with God.

§V. This Son was made man. The divine *person* assumed a human *nature*, lacking its own personality (*persona*), not a divine *nature* assuming a human *nature* or *person*, nor a *person* assuming a *person*. Therefore, Christ remains only one person, a divine one (1 Tim. 3:16).

§VI. In this person, a divine and human nature, each with their own intellect and will, were united.

§VII. This union is not a conjunction of parts, like soul and body, but an assumption of the human nature into unity with the person without change, confusion, division, or separation.

§VIII. But I do not dare to affirm that this generation is by an act of the intellect and spiration by an act of the will.

Controversy – *Was God truly made man? That is, has the second person of the Trinity, the Son of God, assumed a human nature? We affirm against the Socinians.*³

Arguments

1. Because it is set forth as a great mystery that “God was manifested in the flesh” (1 Tim. 3:16). “The Word became flesh” (Jn. 1:14).
2. The same person is God Most High and man (Rom. 9:5) and Immanuel (Is. 7:14), and in Him there is a nature that was dead and one that was not (1 Pet. 3:18).
3. Otherwise, the Father cannot be said to have sent the Son from heaven into the flesh and into the world that He might be His representative (*legatus*) (Jn. 3:13, 16, 10:36; 1 Jn. 4:6). It is necessary that such a representative (*legatus*) would be beforehand in heaven (Jn. 6:62).
4. Nor could the Son have humbled Himself or emptied Himself and by that become a man (Phil. 2:7, Heb. 5:8).
5. Nor could the God of glory have been crucified or redeemed the Church by His own blood (1 Cor. 2:8, Acts 20:28).
6. All the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Him bodily (Col. 2:9).
7. No mere man could become a surety and redeem his brothers (Jer. 30:21, Ps. 49:8) or conquer death (Is. 25:8).

Objections

1. *Then the Father and the Holy Spirit have also been made man, since they are of the same nature.* Reply. It is not the divine nature, which is common to the three persons, that assumed a human nature, but the second person.
2. *Then he ceases to be a person, since he has been made a part.* Reply. No, He assumed a part, but it has been done without any confusion or mixture.
3. *God and man are completely different and therefore cannot be united.* Reply. No more than a soul and body.
4. *If He has been sent from heaven, then He ceases to be in heaven.* Reply. By no means, for He is infinite (Jn. 3:13).

³ “The Socinians deny the personal union, and teach that Christ only had a true human nature. All his prerogatives were merely in the excellence of His attributes and office, not from His nature,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 101.

Controversy 2 – *Was the human nature of Christ also a human person?*
We deny against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Then there would be two distinct persons and none of these things could be said of the same person: “God was manifested in the flesh,” “from the fathers according to the flesh,” “God over all,” “The God of glory was crucified,” etc.
2. We do not read this anywhere in Scripture.

Objections

1. *The humanity of Christ is primarily an intelligent substance.* Reply. But not, however, a person just as our souls are intelligent substances both united to the body and separated from it.
2. *Christ was an individual man.* Reply. If by “man” we understand a human person, then we deny this. He was an individual man through a singular human nature, personally subsisting in the logos.
3. *The human nature acted but actions come from self-existent substances (suppositorum).* Reply. A self-existent substance was the principle which (*quod*). The nature was the principle by which (*quo*). *Objection. Many actions cannot be attributed to a divine self-existent substance (suppositum), such as eating, praying, etc.* Reply. As well as being crucified and dying (Acts 20:28), which are affirmed of God according to the human nature.
4. *Then He is not like us in all things.* Reply. He is in relation to the human nature but not in sin and mode of existing (*subsistendi*).

Controversy 3 – *Is Christ not the Son of God or said to be “the Son of God” according to His human nature?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. He is not the Son of God according to the human nature which is from David but according to that which is spirit (Rom. 1:3-4).
2. He is the Son generated from the Father (Ps. 2:7) but this is not according to the human nature, for it is contrary to the nature of God to generate a man.
3. He is the only begotten Son (Jn. 1:18), but according to the human nature He has brothers (Heb. 2:11) and is not the only begotten.
4. From another perspective, He is the Son of God in a different and more excellent way than the angels themselves (Heb. 1:5);

- therefore, He is not Son in the manner of the creatures, for among them the angels are the sons of God in the most excellent way.
5. According to the human nature, He is without father (Heb. 7:3); therefore, according to that nature, He is not a son.

Objections

1. “*The Holy Spirit will overshadow you; therefore, what is born from you will be called the Son of God*” (Lk. 1:35). Reply. “Therefore” means since being born in this way does not occur except in the case of the eternal Son of God; “therefore,” that it may be said that He is that Son generated from eternity.

§IX. This incarnation is *actively* a work of the entire Trinity (Heb. 10:5) but *passively* of the Son alone (Heb. 2:16).

§X. The Son assumed the human nature from the blood of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit.

§XI. And although the Holy Spirit can be said to have formed Christ’s body, created His soul, and joined them together, the Holy Spirit is not, however, the father of Christ, since nothing is generated from him.

§XII. Consequently, Christ had a true soul (Mt. 26:38) and true body (Heb. 10:5) but without any blemish.

Controversy 1 – *Is Christ a true man?* We affirm against the Anabaptists.⁴

Arguments

1. He is expressly called a man (Jn. 8:40, 1 Cor. 15:21, 1 Tim. 2:5).
2. He is the Son of Man, and of man’s seed (Mt. 1:1, 9:6, 27).
3. He has the parts of a man, a soul and body, as in §X.
4. He died, and the spirit was given to God and the body to the grave (Lk. 23:46, 53).

⁴ “The Anabaptists deny that Christ received flesh and blood from the substance of the Blessed Virgin. The Dutch Anabaptists especially profess more clearly that the flesh of Christ is from the Word of life and from the seed of the Father, because the seed is the Word of God,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 103.

Objections

1. *"I am a worm and not a man"* (Ps. 22:6). Reply. Not by nature but by state.
2. *"In the likeness of flesh"* (Rom. 8:3). Reply. "Sinful flesh" is added.
3. *He assumed the form of a servant* (Phil. 2:6). Reply. This means He assumed the state and condition with the nature. *Objection.* *"Found in form as a man"* (v. 8). Reply. That is, He was recognized as a man.

Controversy 2 – *Did Christ have his flesh from the substance and blood of the Virgin Mary?* We affirm against the Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. He is the seed of the woman, Abraham, and David; therefore, He has His substance from them (Gen. 3:15, 22:18; Rom. 1:3).
2. He is from the fathers according to the flesh (Rom. 9:5), from Judah (Heb. 7:16), and from the loins of David (Acts 2:30).
3. He is the Son of man (Mt. 9:6) and David (21:9), the fruit of the womb of Mary (Lk. 1:42), and just like other infants (Heb. 2:14).
4. He has a genealogy from the Fathers (Mt. 1, Lk. 3).
5. He is a shoot from the root of Jesse (Is. 11:1).

Objections

1. *Women do not have seed.* Reply. Nonsense (Lev. 18:9-10, 12).⁵
2. *He would be a sinner.* Reply. No, He is from Adam as to nature, not as to moral state, because He is another Adam (1 Cor. 15:45).
3. *He is from heaven* (Jn. 3). Reply. Sent by the God whose throne is in heaven like the baptism of John (Mt. 21:25).
4. *He is not from earth but heaven* (1 Cor. 15:48). Reply. In holiness and power.
5. *The Word became flesh* (Jn. 1:14). By assuming flesh from Mary.

Controversy 3 – *Was Mary, then, of the tribe of Judah?* We affirm against the same.⁶

⁵ "This contradicts not only medical science but also the Scriptures which assert that females as well as the males have the power to produce offspring (*foetificandi*) (Gen. 1:28) and attribute seed to the woman (Gen. 16:10). For this reason, there is consanguinity between a brother and a sister from the same mother, even though they have different fathers (Lev. 28:9-10)," Turretin, *Compendium*, 104.

⁶ "Some Jews object [that Christ is not the true Messiah because] Mary was not from the tribe of Judah," Turretin, *Compendium*, 104.

Arguments

1. This is evident from the genealogy of Mary in Luke (Lk. 3:23).
2. Through her Christ was born from Judah (Heb. 7:14).

Objections

1. *Elizabeth, who was the wife of a priest, was the relative of Mary (Lk. 1:36).* Reply. This could happen by the father of Elizabeth being from the tribe of Aaron and her mother from the tribe of Judah and hence the paternal aunt of Mary.
2. *But it was not permitted to marry outside of the tribe (Num. 36).* Reply. It was permitted when the inheritance would not be forfeited, as the case of David demonstrates.

§XIII. The spiritual gifts (*chrismata*) of the human nature are gifts conferred on it by virtue of the personal union, such as holiness, wisdom, power, dignity, etc.

§XIV. These gifts were certainly immense in that created nature but were still finite (Jn. 3:34).

§XV. But this does not inhibit Him from also taking on our imperfections such as hunger, thirst, fatigue, grief, etc., but:

1. No sinful imperfections,
2. No imperfection repugnant to his office, such as blindness or deafness,
3. Not every particular imperfection.

§XVI. The communication of attributes that has arisen from the personal union of the two natures, consists in this:

1. That the properties of both natures are truly attributed to the whole person, such as, Christ has been created and is uncreated and is both finite and infinite.
2. That the properties of one nature can be attributed to the whole person, named from another nature than the one the property belongs to, such as “the Lord of glory has been crucified” (1 Cor. 2:8), and “the Son of man ascends to where He was” (Jn. 6:62).

§XVII. But the properties of one nature have not become the properties of the other nature, nor can they be predicated of them in the abstract. Divinity is not capable of suffering. Humanity is not eternal.

Controversy 1 – *Was the soul of Christ from the beginning in a state of blessedness so that it knew all things and was not able to feel grief?* We deny against the Papists.⁷

Arguments

1. Jesus grew in wisdom, stature, and favor with God and man (Lk. 2:52).
2. “Although He was a Son, He learned obedience from those things which He suffered,” which shows how burdensome it was for Him to expiate sin (Heb. 5:8).
3. He has been made like us in all things, sin excepted (Heb. 2:17, 4:15); therefore, He grew in wisdom as we do.
4. He was ignorant of the Day of Judgment (Mark 13:32).

Objections

1. *The Spirit of wisdom is in Him.* Reply. 1. It is a question of mode and level, not of the Spirit. 2. Nor does it treat there of Christ as an infant but of the performance of His office, when He received the Spirit (Mt. 3:16).
2. *“He gives the Spirit to Him without measure” (Jn. 3:34).* Reply. What does this place say about His infancy? The meaning is not in part or sparingly but the whole Spirit is in Him with gifts in relation to the requirements of His age and offices.
3. *“All the treasures of wisdom are in Him” (Col. 2:23).* Reply. Objectively, in His person and offices are found whatever we must know (1 Cor. 12).
4. *The divine nature was united with the human nature (Col. 2:9).* Reply. But what was in the divine nature was not therefore transferred to the human nature.

Controversy 2 – *Was the holiness of Christ not only a quality required in His person but also pertaining to His mediatorial office?* We affirm against certain Frenchmen.

Arguments

1. Christ as Mediator and priest had to be holy and was (Heb. 7:26); therefore, it pertains to His office.

⁷ “The fundamental error (*prōton pseudos*) according to Henry Alting is that the Papists so extol the habitual gifts that follow the union that they nearly abolish the condition of the human nature and confound Christ’s state of humiliation with His state of exaltation and glory,” Bernhardinus De Moor, *Commentarius Perpetuus*, XIX:22, 3:800.

2. He was cut off *as* a spotless lamb (1 Pet. 1:19). *N.B.*, “as.”
3. Our nature has been sanctified in His (1 Cor. 1:30, Col. 2:10); therefore, He has this holiness as a public person.
4. Because just as we have been circumcised in His circumcision and baptized in His baptism, so we are also sanctified in His holy birth (Col. 2:11).
5. He was born for us; therefore, He was also born holy for us (Is. 9:5).

Objections

1. *It is a quality of the person.* Reply. The person is also mediator.
2. *Those things which are duties and offices are free, but Christ had to be born holy.* Reply. All things were both free and necessary for Christ as God. He could have not been born and not performed the office. But if He was to be born, He would have to be born holy and perform the office of the mediator with holiness.

Controversy 3 – *Was Christ on account of the personal union so holy that He was not able to sin?* We affirm against the scholastics and Arminians.⁸

Arguments

1. The devil could not do anything against Him (Jn. 14:30).
2. Everything He does, He does by the person (*hypstasi*) of the divine nature, although the actions are of the natures (*suppositorum*) (Acts 20:28), but that person cannot sin.
3. Then the union could be dissolved, since God has no communion with sin (Is. 59:2, 2 Cor. 6:14).
4. Christ, as a sinner, could be damned (Gal. 3:10).
5. Then God could lie in promises and predictions contrary to Heb. 6:17.
6. Then Christ could be cut off from the mediatorial office, and thus the foundation of salvation could be overturned contrary to Acts 2:25.

⁸ The motivation of the Arminians is to preserve their definition of free will as indifference. Thus, Rijssen answers this same controversy in Turretin, *Compendium*, “Freedom does not consist in such indifference (*adiaphora*), as we proved above in the doctrine of free will,” 106.

Objection

1. *He was free; therefore He was able to sin.* Reply. So God and the angels in heaven are free, and will we be free after the judgment.

Controversy 4 – *Are the properties of the divine nature such as omnipresence, omnipotence, and adoration communicated to the human nature?* We deny against the Lutherans.⁹

Arguments

1. The properties of the divine nature are God Himself, but human nature cannot become God and therefore not omnipotent, etc.
2. If one property could be communicated, then all could be communicated. But eternity cannot be communicated; therefore, the rest cannot either.
3. The properties of God are His own glory (Is. 6 with Jn. 12:41), but He cannot give the glory of God to another (Is. 42:8).
4. God is recognized from the divine attributes (Rom. 1:20-21), which could not occur if they were communicated to creatures.
5. The properties of the divine nature can no more be given to the human nature than those of the human nature can be communicated to the divine nature.
6. Against omnipresence, Jn. 11:15, Heb. 8:4; against omniscience, Mk. 13:32; against omnipotence, 2 Cor. 13:4; against being worthy of worship, Mt. 4:10.

Objections

1. *He communicated the whole of Himself to the flesh.* Reply. Only such that there would be one person with the flesh.
2. *The fullness of the deity dwells in Him bodily.* Reply. This means not in shadows but truly in that person.
3. *“He has the Spirit without measure” (Jn. 3:34).* Reply. The Spirit denotes grace and gifts not divine attributes.
4. *He is sitting at the right hand of God, which is everywhere.* Reply. This means that He received a state and honor under God, the highest over all creatures, and infinity is attributed to Him as Mediator not as man.

⁹ “The origin of this controversy is to be found among other things in that of the Lord’s Supper. The Lutherans take refuge in ubiquity in order to better defend the bodily presence of Christ. Luther indeed rejected it, but Brentz and others reestablished it. And when some objected to them that ubiquity was a property of God, they concluded that other divine properties were transferred to the humanity of Christ in virtue of the hypostatic union,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 106.

5. “*All power has been given to me*” (Mt. 28:18). Reply. All the powers of the creatures have been subjected to Me as Mediator. They have not been given to the flesh. N.B. If all these things were true, it would also prove that the flesh of Christ is spiritual, eternal, infinite, and not composed just as much as they would prove that it is omnipotent and omnipresent.

§XVIII. An operation (*apotelesma*)¹⁰ is one work proceeding from both natures. In this operation (*apotelesma*) the divine has a divine energy and the human nature a human energy, such as justification and glorification.

§XIX. An energy is a power and operation of a particular nature. The divine energy in its mode is divine; the human nature only has human energy. Thus, the actions are two, but the work is one. “By the spirit He offered Himself” (Heb. 9:14).

§XX. Each nature exerts these powers in the office of Christ the Mediator. But the Mediator is:

1. Unique (1 Tim. 2:5),
2. Perfect (Heb. 7:25),
3. And acting as surety and making payment (*spondens et solvens*) (Mt. 26:28)
4. For all believers of the Old and New Testament and all their sins (Rom. 3:25)
5. According to both natures.

§XXI. When it is said concerning this duty that He is *anointed*, it signifies:

1. That He was chosen to this office (1 Pet. 1:20),
2. Fitness (Heb. 1:9),
3. And confirmed in this office (Jn. 6:27).

Controversy 1 – *Does the mediatorial office of Christ consist in this, that He would teach men the way of salvation and confirm that doctrine with His blood?* We deny against the Socinians.¹¹

¹⁰ This is a difficult word to translate and an important technical word. I have provided one English word, but it could be translated as completed work, work, action, or operation.

¹¹ “The Socinians indeed confess that Christ is a Mediator but only: 1. Of divine instruction or revelation by which Christ declared the way of salvation, which, according to them, consists only in obedience to the commandments of God. 2. Of example, because He walked in the same way, and exhibited His perfection as a pattern. 3. Of confirmation, because He ratified His obedience by His death and

Arguments

1. Since He is Mediator of the New Testament so that He might wipe away sin by means of death (Heb. 9:15).
2. As Mediator He pays a price (*antilutron*) (1 Tim. 2:5-6, Mt. 20:28).
3. Because He is a surety, fulfilling the law and bearing the punishment in our place (Heb. 7:22).
4. If He was only Mediator as teacher (*interloquens*), then He would be Mediator of Judas and the Pharisees, who sinned against the Holy Spirit contrary to Jn. 13:18.
5. Then He would not be mediator of the fathers of the Old Testament contrary to Col. 1:20 and Heb. 9:15.
6. Then God would not demonstrate His righteousness in Him, nor justify believers according to the law contrary to Rom. 3:24-25.

Objections

1. *Moses is called a mediator (Gal. 3:19)*. Reply. As a type typically reconciling (Ex. 34:4-5).¹²
2. *He is Mediator of the promise of the covenant (Heb. 8:6)*. Reply. It has been established in Him such that He would bear the punishments due to us by the law.

Controversy 2 – *Was Christ only a mediator according to the human nature so that all mediatorial works are from the human nature?* We deny against the Papists.¹³

Arguments

1. Christ according to both natures is our prophet and king and, therefore, also Mediator.
2. He already performed mediatorial works in the Old Testament (Is. 63:9, Zech. 1:12, Rev. 13:8), but at that time He was not yet man.
3. The whole person is described as Mediator (*Jehovah, God* [Hos. 1:7, Acts 20:28]).

passion. Their purpose is to overthrow the whole doctrine of the satisfaction,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 108.

¹² “Moses is only typically said to be a Mediator, just as the law was a type of the Gospel, not as if he were equal to Christ in all things, but only that he gives a shadow of Him in a lesser way,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 108.

¹³ “The Papists press this point in order to more easily establish that there are many Mediators,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 108.

4. There are many works that the human nature cannot perform, such as overcoming death, raising up both Himself and us (Rom. 1:4, Jn. 6:40), sending the Holy Spirit (Jn. 16:7), opening hearts (Lk. 24:45), and guarding us in grace (Jn. 10:28).

Objections

1. *There is one Mediator, the man Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 2:5).* Reply. Not only man but also God, “God redeemed us by His blood” (Acts 20:28).
2. *Then all persons of the Trinity are mediators.* Reply. No more than all three were made man.
3. *The divine nature was an offended party.* Reply. We can grant that, although persons are properly offended parties. Objection. *Then He was a Mediator of Himself.* Reply. Why not? “God was reconciling the world to Himself” (2 Cor. 5:19). On the other hand, the Father as person acted as judge and the Son as Mediator.
4. *Then according to the divine nature He was less than the Father.* Reply. No, since the person not the nature is Mediator, although He does many things through the nature. The person was less according to *state* and *office* but equal according to *nature*.

Controversy 3 – *Besides Christ, are there many true mediators?* We deny against the papists.

Arguments

1. There is one Mediator (1 Tim. 2:5), one Advocate before the Father (1 Jn. 2:1), and one Lord (1 Cor. 8:6).
2. There is no other name of a mediator given under heaven (Acts 4:12), nor does anyone come to the Father except through Him (Jn. 14:6).
3. All promises in Christ are amen; therefore, He alone is Mediator (2 Cor. 1:20).
4. If men were mediators, we would be able to glory in man contrary to Gal. 6:14; we would be able to know many contrary 1 Cor. 2:2.
5. If many were Mediators, many should interpose their blood (Heb. 9:25), which they cannot do (1 Cor. 1:13).

Objections

1. *“Moses was a mediator” (Dt. 5:5).* Reply. A messenger (*internunciatus*) of God to the people not a mediator for the people to God.

2. *“Job will pray for you” (Job 42:8).* Reply. Not as a mediator but as a man, a friend, and servant of God.

Chapter 12

Christ's Offices

§I. There are three parts of this mediatorial office. Christ is a *prophet* who *externally*:

1. Teaches that the Gospel is fulfilled in Himself (Heb. 2:3).
2. Explains the Law of Moses (Mt. 5:20).
3. Predicts the future (Mt. 24:25).

And *Internally*:

1. Illuminates the eyes (Lk. 24:45).
2. Changes the heart (Acts 16:14).

He is a *priest* and thus:

1. Fulfills the law.
2. Offers Himself for our sins.
3. Intercedes for us (Rom. 8:3, 34).

He is a spiritual King and thus:

1. Gathers the Church.
2. Rules it.
3. Preserves it.
4. Blesses it (Jn. 10:16, 27-28).
5. Restraints and overthrows both the human and angelic enemies of the Church (Rom. 16:20).

§II. Christ performs these offices in three distinct ways: *now*, when He was *on the earth*, and *from the beginning before He came into the world*. Before He came into the world, He gathered the Church by His Word and Spirit, atoned for (*expiavit*) her by the future satisfaction, interceded for her, and subdued her enemies (Heb. 13:8, Rev. 13:8).

Controversy 1 – *Was Christ taken into heaven before He began the prophetic duty that He might hear God Himself and be taught the things which He was soon to announce to the world?* We deny against the Socinians.¹

¹ “The purpose of the Socinians is to elude the passages of Scripture by which we prove that Christ existed before He was born of the virgin because He came forth from the Father and descended from heaven,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 111.

Arguments

1. Christ only entered heaven once (Heb. 9:12).
2. And that was only after His passion and death (Lk. 14:26) and the cleansing of our sins (Heb. 1:3).
3. A priest was not able to enter into the Holy of Holies without blood (Heb. 9:7); therefore, neither was Christ, without first shedding His blood.
4. Nor was it necessary for Christ, who was God Himself manifested in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16), to go to heaven that He might teach.

Objections

1. *It is said that He descended from heaven (Jn. 3:13).* Reply. As the baptism of John was not from heaven (Mt. 21:25) because it was there before but because it had been given by God.
2. *“If you see the Son of Man ascending to where He was before” (Jn. 6:62).* Reply. The Son of Man also was the Son of the Father, true God, and so always in the presence of the Father, and still was, though He was veiled in the flesh.
3. *Moses and Paul were taken into heaven.* Reply. Concerning Moses, it is false. Concerning Paul, even he did not know whether or not he went in the body or what the consequence of this was.
4. *He was taught by the Father (Jn. 8:48).* Reply. And so are we (Jn. 6:45)

Controversy 2 – *Did Christ as a prophet correct the moral law and increase it by adding self-denial, taking up the cross, imitation of Christ, and other things?* We deny against the Socinians, Arminians, and Papists.²

Arguments

1. The law is perfect (Ps. 19:7) and contains all things that are required for the love of God and our neighbor (Mt. 22:40).
2. For this reason, no other commandment is to be added to it (Dt. 4:2).
3. Nor is there *any other commandment* than that which is found in that law (Rom. 13:8-10).

² The goal of the Socinians is to establish their doctrine that Christ is Savior as a teacher not a redeemer; “to establish justification through works of men, not indeed through meritorious works, in which they differ from the Papists, but by accepting their works”; and to establish that immortality was not promised in the Old Testament. The Papists want the Gospel to have the relationship to the law of a type and a fulfillment (see Turretin, *Compendium*, 111-112).

4. The law has been given through Moses but grace through Christ (Jn. 1:17), and thus there is only one Legislator (James 4:21).
5. All these have been commanded: denial of self (Eccl. 11:9-10), taking up the cross (Lam. 3:27-28), and imitation of Christ (Dt. 18:15, Heb. 11:25).

Objections

1. *He who fulfills the law completes it, but Christ fulfills the law (Mt. 5:17).* Reply. To fulfill is to do (Gal. 6:2), and you fulfill the law of Christ.
2. *A new commandment I give to you that you love one another (Jn. 13:34).* Reply. But this is commanded in the law (Rom. 13:8); therefore, new means renewed, “I command you this anew (*de novo*).”
3. *Christ corrected the law (Mt. 5).* Reply. He only vindicated it from the corruptions of the Pharisees.
4. *Christ added a command to worship Him.* Reply. Not at all, for it says, “Kiss the Son” (Ps. 2:12) and “Worship him, for He is your God” (Ps. 45:11).

Controversy 1 on the Priesthood – *Was Christ a true priest who offered a true sacrifice? And is He not called a priest on account of any similarity to it and His government of us? We affirm against the Socinians.*³

Arguments

1. The priests of the Old Testament were only priests insofar as they were types of Christ; therefore, He is a true priest (Heb. 7:15, 8:2-3).
2. The Apostle infers from the rule “every priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices to God” that “He therefore had to have something to offer” (Heb. 8:3, 5:1, 4:5); therefore, he teaches that He is truly a priest.
3. A true priest is one who has been constituted such by God and offers a true victim to Him, but Christ did this (Heb. 10:12, 9:28; Eph. 5:2).
4. Christ in relation to His establishment as priest, person, office, and victim is a far more perfect priest; therefore, He is a true one (Heb. 7).

³ “Although the Socinians confess with their mouth the priesthood of Christ, they deny the thing itself when they change His priesthood from a proper one into a figurative one, so that they may more easily remove the truth of His satisfaction,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 113.

Objections

1. *He is said to be a priest because of His mercy (Heb. 2:17).* Reply. This virtue belongs to the person of the priest not the priesthood.
2. *Someone who intercedes for us is called a priest.* Reply. This is only the other part of the office, and how great it is depends on the sacrifice (1 Jn. 2:1-2).

Controversy 2 on the Priesthood – *Was Christ made a priest not on earth but only in heaven?* We deny against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Every priest is appointed to offer victims on earth (Heb. 10:1). And under that rule Christ is expressly included, “They make them continually” (Ibid.).
2. When someone has offered a sacrifice, there was a true priest. But He offered the sacrifice on earth (Eph. 5:2, Heb. 10:14).
3. It is expressly stated that He only ascended into heaven after having performed a sacrifice (Heb. 1:3, 9:12, 28, 10:12).
4. The sacrifice of Christ was performed in one place or performed once and at one time (Heb. 9:25, 28, 10:12). But if the sacrifice was His intercession for us in heaven, it would be repeated often.

Objections

1. *“We have a great High Priest who has gone into the heavens” (Heb. 4:14).* Reply. Having performed the sacrifice on earth.
2. *If he were on earth, he would not be a priest (Heb. 8:3).* Reply. After having performed the sacrifice, for then He had to ascend into heaven.
3. *God only called Him a priest after He had done all things (Heb. 5:9).* Reply. Declared and praised Him as a priest.

Controversy 3 – *Did Christ sustain the punishment owed to our sins in our place and in that way make satisfy the punitive justice of God?* We affirm against the Socinians.⁴

⁴ “The Socinians deny this foundation of Christianity and our consolation and indeed press this point with ungodly blasphemies wanting Christ only to have suffered for our good, for confirming doctrine, to give us an example of love and patience, to experience evils, and to acquire the highest glory for Himself,” Johannes à Marck, *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, XIX.22.

Arguments

1. Christ took the punishment owed to our sins (Is. 53:5, 10-11, 1 Pet. 2:24, Gal. 3:13).
2. He died for us and in our place (Jn. 10:11, 11:50, 1 Pet. 3:18).
3. He redeemed us by His blood as a ransom (*lutrō et antilutrō*) (Mt. 20:28, Acts 20:28, 1 Tim. 2:6, Rev. 5:9).
4. He also removed our offences by His blood (Col. 2:14, Heb. 1:3, 1 Jn. 1:7, Rev. 1:5).
5. And He reconciled us to God in this way (Rom. 3:25, 5:10, 2 Cor. 5:19).

Objections

1. *No one can die for anyone else (Ez. 18:20).* Reply. Someone can, if God appoints him as a surety.
2. *God remits sins freely (Mt. 18:27).* Reply. In relation to us, for we pay nothing.
3. *Punishment of the body cannot be transferred to another.* Reply. It can, if it seems good to God and the surety.
4. *The punishment of sin is eternal death, which Christ did not take.* Reply. He took the same death that is eternal in those who are condemned, because they cannot redeem themselves.
5. *God loved us even before that satisfaction.* Reply. By a love of benevolence; however, as a judge He would have had to execute His justice on us unless a satisfaction had intervened.

§III. The fruits of the satisfaction of Christ are:

1. The appeasement of God as judge (Rom. 5:10).
2. Remission of sins (Eph. 1:7).
3. Liberation from hell and enemies (Rom. 8:1).
4. Acquisition of a right to life (Rev. 5:9).

Controversy 4 on the Priesthood – *Did Christ by His obedience acquire and merit for us a right to eternal life?* We affirm against the Socinians.⁵

⁵ In Turretin, *Compendium*, Rijssen has “Arminians” and quotes Turretin: “The Arminians prefer to say that Christ has not acquired so much redemption and salvation for us as only a possibility of salvation and the possibility of the Father making a new covenant of grace with men,” 119.

Arguments

1. That life had been promised to Christ on the condition of obedience (Is. 53:10, Ps. 2:8); therefore, that life has been merited by the fulfilled condition.
2. The law says concerning merit, “Do this and live” (Rom. 10:5). But Christ did this; therefore, it has been merited.
3. He who acquires a right to life has merited it. But Christ did this; therefore... (Rom. 8:3).
4. Christ undertook all His suffering expressly under the condition of merit (Heb. 12:2).

Objections

1. *Salvation is given by grace and therefore not by merit.* Reply. The Mediator is sent for us by grace. His merit and salvation are given because He paid for us.
2. *Christ interceded and prayed (Heb. 5:9).* Reply. And this is also a part of His merit, for God wanted Him to fulfill all righteousness.
3. *Christ had to fulfill the law for Himself (Gal. 4:4).* Reply. No. It is a mediatorial work, which He performed for us as appears from v. 5.

§IV. And He did not only merit salvation for us. He also merited all grace.

Controversy 5 on the Priesthood – *Did Christ also merit for us the Spirit of regeneration?* We affirm against the Arminians.⁶

Arguments

1. He merited all things promised to us in the new covenant (2 Cor. 1:20, Heb. 8:6), but the promise of the Spirit of faith is included in these promises.
2. In Christ and on account of Christ all spiritual blessings are given to us (Eph. 1:3); therefore, He merited them.
3. He made us perfect by one sacrifice (Heb. 10:14); therefore, He acquired all things necessary.
4. He Himself obtained the Spirit so that He might sanctify and bless us unto the end (Jn. 17:17, Eph. 5:25-26); therefore, He merited the Spirit of regeneration.

⁶ See also Chap. 10, pp. 106-108.

Objections

1. *Faith and repentance are our acts, which no one can merit.* Reply. They are also gifts of God (Eph. 2:8), and Christ merited them as such.
2. *Faith is a condition which God requires of us.* Reply. The law requires it, but God in the new covenant promises it on account of the satisfaction of Christ.
3. *God freely gives us faith, but in this case He would be obligated.* Reply. As it is in salvation. His obligation is voluntary and does not contradict His liberty.

§V. Although the satisfaction of Christ can be said to be sufficient for each and every sin, if God had so desired it; however, in the act, it has only been fulfilled for those who are saved.

Controversy 2 – *Did Christ by His obedience satisfy for all the sins of each and every individual human being?* We deny against the Papists and Arminians.⁷

Arguments

1. Christ as a faithful shepherd laid down His life not for the wolves but His sheep (Jn. 10:15), the Church (Acts 20:28).
2. Christ as a priest did not “sanctify” or offer Himself for every single person, nor did He ask for their salvation (Jn. 17:9, 19).
3. Christ only died for those for whom He rose (Rom. 4:25, 6:4), but He did not rise for every single person (Ibid., Jn. 12:32).
4. Not every single person has been written in the Lamb’s book of life (Rev. 13:8); therefore, He could not die for them but only for those who have been given to Him by the Father (Jn. 6:39).
5. Christ redeemed from the curse and the wrath of God (Rom. 5:9-10) those for whom He died (Gal. 3:13), but He did not do this for every single person (Gal. 3:10).
6. The covenant of grace has not been entered into with every single person, as has been shown before;⁸ therefore, He was not able to die for every one of these people as Mediator of that covenant.

⁷ “All Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians; the Jesuits with the Jansenists opposing them; the Arminians in their words and method; and the more recent Lutherans and our universalists urge the universal extent of the sacrifice of Christ to all men,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 120.

⁸ See Chap. 10, pp. 102-104.

7. If He had died for every single person, He would have died for many in vain contrary to Gal. 2:21.

Objections

1. *Christ died for the world (Jn. 3:16, 1 Jn. 2:2).* Reply. For the world of those who will be saved (Jn. 17:17, 23), as also in 1 Jn. 2:2 where “world” refers to those from the Gentiles who are saved.
2. *He died for all (1 Tim. 2:6).* Reply. For all *of His own*, from whatever category they are. “All in Christ will be made alive” (1 Cor. 15:22).
3. *He died for those who perish (2 Pet. 2:1).* Reply. This refers to those who were external members of the Church,⁹ and they boasted that they were redeemed by Christ as in Tit. 1:16.
4. *Just as all were made sinners in Adam, so all are redeemed through Christ (Rom. 5:19).* Reply. It says “were constituted righteous,” which they are not (cf. v. 17).
5. *Everyone should believe that Christ died for him; therefore, it is true.* Reply. No more than that they should believe that they will be saved. No one should believe these things to be true before they receive Christ as their Mediator.

Controversy 3¹⁰ – *Will that which Christ has merited by His death also be applied to all for whom He has merited it?* We affirm against the Arminians.

Arguments

1. Whomever the Father gives to the Son will come to Him (Jn. 6:37).
2. In every payment of a surety, it is applied to the person who owes and his debts; therefore, liberation must follow (Rom. 8:1).
3. That which is obtained for someone through the death of Christ by right (*jure*) cannot be denied to that person.
4. The end (*finis*) of Christ’ death and the Father’s sending of Him is the application [of salvation], and this end cannot fail to happen (2 Cor. 5:15).

⁹ He explains the word “redeemed” in 2 Pet. 2:1 to mean those who were external members of the Church and not those who were redeemed by the blood of Christ for salvation. Turretin wrote: “Redemption from the curse of God and from eternal death cannot properly be understood here but liberation from error and idolatry through the external calling of the Christian,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 122.

¹⁰ The original text has “controversy two,” but it seems that controversy 3 is intended.

Objections

1. *He sent the Son into the world that all who believe might have salvation (Jn. 3:16).* Reply. Nor did He send Him for any others than those to whom He gives faith and salvation.
2. *The application depends on us.* Reply. *Application of the price to the persons* already happened by the payment of Christ. The *application of the benefits* [fructuum] depends on the merit of Christ not on our will.

§VI. The other part of the priesthood of Christ is intercession. It began on earth and has been perfected in heaven (Jn. 17:1). The intercession in heaven includes:

1. A *presentation* of the satisfaction.
2. A *will* that what has been merited be applied to us.
3. *Refutation of the accusations* of Satan (Heb. 9:14, 1 Jn. 2:2, Rom. 8:34).

§VII. The *Kingly office of Christ* is the power to apply all the things that He has merited for the salvation of those for whom He has merited and to protect them against whatever opposes this (Mt. 28:18).

§VIII. By this power Christ gives to the elect the word, the Spirit, faith, constancy, and salvation (Jn. 10:28, 15:16, 26).

Controversy 1 – *Was Christ King on earth, or has He only been made a King in heaven?* We affirm the former and deny the latter against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. He was born King (Mt. 2:2). He came as King (Mt. 21:5). He admitted that He was a King (Jn. 18:36-37). The King of glory was crucified (1 Cor. 2:8).
2. Angels served Him (Mt. 4:11). They worshiped Him as God and their Creator (Heb. 1:6).
3. He had power over the devil (Mt. 8:16), sickness (8:15), wind (8:27), death (9:25), and all things (Jn. 3:35).
4. He forgave sins (Mt. 9:6) and gave the Spirit (Jn. 20:22).

Objections

1. *“All power has been given to Me” (Mt. 28:18).* Reply. This means that all powers have now been subjected to Me as *victorious* and

triumphant, which did not occur as splendidly while He was in the form of a servant.

2. “*God made Him Lord*” (Acts 2:33, 36). Reply. This means He was taken to a greater glory.
3. “*Taken into heaven, all things having been subjected to Him*” (1 Pet. 3:22). Reply. As to victory and triumph, but a king before his victory is still a king.

Controversy 2 – *Does Christ alone now rule in the Church and not the Father?* We deny against the Socinians.¹¹

Arguments

1. All grace is from the Father and the Son (1 Cor. 1:3, Eph. 1:2).
2. For that reason all things are sought from the Father (Mt. 6:9, Eph. 3:15).
3. Praise and honor are also given to the Father (Phil. 4:20, Eph. 5:20).
4. The Father also brought us out of the kingdom of darkness (Col. 1:12-13, Phil. 2:12).
5. The Father, the Son and the Spirit are one (1 Jn. 5:7).

Objections

1. “*To me has been given all power*” (Mt. 28:18). Reply. This means: not to the Father alone but all powers have also been subjected to Me.
2. “*Christ is all in all*” (Col. 3:11). Reply. He is sufficient in all things pertaining to salvation from the Father and with the Father (1 Cor. 8:6).

SIX. The kingdom of Christ is either of *grace* in which He reigns through the word, the Spirit and sacraments administered by divine power, or of *glory*, which is now begun in heaven and will be complete on the day of judgment.

- X. Therefore, the kingdom of Christ will last into eternity:
1. In relation to the dignity of the person.
 2. In relation to His power over angels and believers.

¹¹ The Socinians could not deny all deity to Christ. Consequently, they affirmed that He was called God and worshipped and honored because He was the vicar of the Father in the rule of the Church and the world. Toward this end, the Father communicated to Him some of His own authority, glory, and power (see Johann Friedrich Stapfer, *Intitutiones Theologiae Polemicae*, XII.39-40).

3. By the honors to be received from them (Rev. 22:3).

Controversy – *Will the kingdom of Christ last forever?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹²

Arguments

1. From what it is called. It is said to be an eternal kingdom (Lk. 1:33, 2 Pet. 1:11), an eternal throne (Heb. 1:8), an eternal power (Dan. 7:14), and an eternal dominion (Rev. 11:15).
2. Christ will sit unto eternity at the right hand of God (Ps. 45:6, Rev. 3:21), but this is essentially to have the highest power in all things under God.
3. Christ is a priest forever (Ps. 110:4); therefore, the power and glory of His sacrifice will remain unto eternity.
4. Christ will remain their preserver and joy unto eternity (Rev. 7:17), and they will worship Him (Rev. 22:3).

Objections

1. *He will give the kingdom to the Father, and then it will be the end* (1 Cor. 15:24). Reply. The kingdom is the Church.
2. *God will be all in all* (1 Cor. 15:28). Reply. Also through Christ the Mediator.
3. *He will be subjected to the Father* (ibid.). Reply. As Mediator, sitting at the right hand of God.
4. *The power of Christ is only for the salvation of believers*. Reply. Since salvation is eternal, the power of the Savior should also be eternal.

§XI. There are two states of Christ: *humiliation* and *exaltation*.

§XII. The state of humiliation of the person of the Son includes:

1. The incarnation,
2. The passion,
3. The crucifixion,
4. Death,
5. Burial,
6. And descent into hell.

¹² “In order to reduce the dignity and divinity of our mediator, the Socinians hold that this kingdom will cease on the last day,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 124. He notes that also some of the Orthodox believed that this kingdom would be replaced by only an essential as opposed to a mediatorial reign. “Although we concede that this kingdom can change as to form and mode of administration, we hold, however, that the substance of the kingdom will remain unto eternity,” Ibid.

§XIII. To the state of exaltation pertains:

1. Resurrection from the dead,
2. Ascent into heaven,
3. Sitting at the right hand,
4. And coming for judgment.

§XIV. Christ then truly suffered in His soul and took the punishment which we would have received when we were condemned but:

1. Not all types.
2. Not as long a time.
3. Not in that place.
4. Not with those effects.

But He felt the just wrath of God, which we had merited by our sins, falling on Him as surety.

Controversy 1 – *Did Christ suffer not only in the emotional (sensitive) faculty of the soul or through compassion but also in the soul as rational?*
We affirm against the Papists.¹³

Arguments

1. His soul was sorrowful unto death (Mt. 26:38, Jn. 12:27) and had anxiety (Heb. 5:7).
2. He took the wrath of God in His rational soul (Ps. 22:1, Gal. 3:13).
3. His soul was the price, and He labored in it (Is. 53:10-11).
4. As we have been corrupted in Adam, so are we restored in Christ (Rom. 5:19). But we are corrupted through the sin of the soul; therefore, we are restored by the suffering of the soul.
5. He was deserted by the Father as to consolation and joy (Mt. 27:46); therefore, He suffered in the soul.

Objections

1. *He took our sins in the body (1 Pet. 2:24).* Reply. Not in body only but also in the soul.

¹³ “The Papists...distinguish the inferior and sensitive part of the soul from the superior and rational.” They concede that the lower part suffered, but they deny that the higher part suffered. If they admit that he suffered in the higher part, they deny that it was “out of a sense of the wrath of God...but only...sympathetically, on account of the communion of the soul with the body,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 126. “We hold that it was necessary for our redemption that Christ should not only suffer bodily pains but also feel the very anguish and horror of soul: that as by his death we are redeemed both body and soul, so He should pay the ransom for both in body and soul,” Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*, 603.

2. *“We have redemption by His blood and death” (Eph. 1:7).* Reply. Death is a great part of the obedience but not the whole of it. It is also a death of the soul, namely, a sense of the wrath of God.
3. *The soul of Christ had not sinned; therefore, it could not die (Ez. 18:20).* Reply. He took our sins on Himself (Is. 53:6).
4. *The Jews did not crucify the soul of Christ.* Reply. God also made Him suffer (Is. 53:4).

Controversy 2 – *Can Christ truly be said to have taken the punishment of hell in death?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The terrors of hell encircled him (Ps. 18:4, 116:3).
2. Christ has been freed from the terrors of hell (Ps. 16:10, 86:13, and Acts 2:24 according to the Vulgate).
3. Christ took the curse (Gal. 3:13), but this is the punishment of hell (Mt. 25:41).
4. Christ took all our punishments (Is. 53:4-6) and therefore those that we would have had in hell.

Objections

1. *The bodily punishment of Christ is sufficiently meritorious.* Reply. No, the suffering of the soul should also be present.
2. *It is against the dignity of the person.* Reply. No more than to suffer in the body.
3. *The punishment of hell is not meritorious.* Reply. Not in the damned but certainly in Christ just as the punishment of the body is not meritorious in the damned but is in Christ.
4. *We should imitate the sufferings of Christ, but we cannot imitate these.* Reply. 1. We should not imitate them insofar as they are meritorious. 2. However, we imitate them bearing the paternal wrath of God (Ps. 88:15-16).

Controversy 3 – *Did Christ merit blessedness or heavenly glory for Himself?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. All the obedience of Christ is mediatorial, which means that it is fulfilled by Christ as Mediator, “Lo! I am here to do your will” (Heb. 10:9). But He was Mediator for us not for Himself (1 Tim. 2:5-6).
2. He did not die for Himself but “that which He died, He died for sins” (Rom. 6:10); therefore, He merited nothing for himself, since

- none of His merit is without death, “He was sanctified through suffering” (Heb. 2:10).
3. Before all His merit, He was “heir of all things” (Heb. 1:2), but an inheritance is not acquired by merit.
 4. All glory was due to His person as the Son of God without any merit. For this reason, when asking for glory, He did not ask to attain it by merit but asked for that which He had from eternity (Jn. 17:4).
 5. “He was made under the law that He might redeem those under the law,” not for Himself (Gal. 4:4, Rom. 8:3). For in Himself, He was Lord of the law (Mk. 2:28, Heb. 5:8).
 6. The goal of the sending and coming of Christ was that “He might be a merciful priest” (Heb. 2:17) to give His soul as a ransom (v. 14, Mt. 20); therefore, it was not for Himself.
 7. If Christ owed it for Himself, then certainly great grace has been given to Him so that it could also pay for us.

Objections

1. “*Therefore God exalted him*” (Phil. 2:9). Reply. Declaring and manifesting who He is and what He fulfilled for them as in Mt. 17:25.
2. “*For the joy set before Him, He endured the cross*” (Heb. 12:2). Reply. That is, for the glory following from it, that He would save the Church as in Heb. 1:6.
3. “*He should suffer and afterwards enter into glory*” (Lk. 24:26). Reply. It is clear that He *owed suffering* not for Himself but for us; consequently, this verse refers to what order in which, not to the merit by which, these things would happen to the Mediator.

Controversy 4 – *Did the soul of Christ after death descend to any limbus patrum¹⁴ or purgatory?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The soul of Christ ascended into heaven at the moment of death (Lk. 23:43).
2. Christ perfected and concluded the whole work of our salvation by the sacrifice of His death (Heb. 10:14).
3. There is no such *limbus*; therefore, Christ could not descend to it.

¹⁴ See Chap. 18, pp. 248-249.

Objections

1. “*You will not leave My soul in hell*” (Acts 2:27, Ps. 16:10). Reply. In the sorrows of hell that He endured to the full before His death not after it.
2. “*Three days in the belly of the earth*” (Mt. 12:40). Reply. That is, the body in the tomb.
3. “*He preached to spirits in prison*” (1 Pet. 3:19). He preached to them *through Noah* when they were living, as it is added, who “are now in prison.”
4. “*Who shall descend into the abyss in order to call back Christ from the dead*” (Rom. 10:7)? Reply. It says nothing about Christ except that He was dead. “Who shall descend?” is an evil question of the weak.

§XV. Resurrection is an act of the kingly office and is:

1. Victory over death.
2. The sign of the completeness of the satisfaction.
3. Therefore Christ’s own absolution and ours in Him.
4. The next (*proximus*) step to glory (Rom. 4:25, 6:4).

Controversy – *Did Christ rise from the dead by His own power?* We affirm against the Socinians.¹⁵

Arguments

1. Christ said that He Himself would restore the broken temple of His body (Jn. 2:19).
2. He has power to lay down His life and take it up again (Jn. 10:17-18).
3. Christ has the keys of death and hell (Rev. 1:18); therefore, He Himself can overcome it.
4. If He has been raised and did not rise by His own power, then He would not have conquered death contrary to Is. 25:8.
5. Christ is the resurrection and the life (Jn. 11:25), which He would not be, if He could not raise himself.

Objections

1. *He is said to have been raised by the Father* (Acts 2:24). Reply. 1. The power of the Father is the power of the Son. 2. He is said to

¹⁵ “The Socinians say that Christ was a mere man, and thus they hold that Christ did not raise Himself up by His own power but was raised by the power of God,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 128.

have been raised by the Father insofar as He has been dismissed by the Father from death as from a prison.

2. *No one can raise himself.* Reply. Except one who is a God-man (*theanthrōpos*).

§XVI. And He ascended:

1. Visibly.
2. By a true change of place.
3. That He might appear on our behalf before God.

§XVII. He sits at the right hand of God, which includes:

1. The glorification of His body,
2. A clearer manifestation of His divinity,
3. The coronation of Christ the Mediator,
4. And His sitting on the throne of majesty and power over all creatures (Rev. 3:21).

Controversy 1 – *Is Christ’s body not only in heaven but also everywhere on earth?* We deny against the Lutherans.¹⁶

Arguments

1. He went to the Father and left the world; therefore, He is not in it by His body (Jn. 16:28).
2. He is expressly said not to be on the earth (Heb. 8:4).
3. Because when false prophets would say, “There is Christ, here is Christ,” He does not want this to be believed (Mt. 24:26).
4. Heaven must receive him until the time of judgment (Acts 3:21).
5. If the body of Christ were everywhere, it would not be able to be seen contrary to Rev. 1:7.
6. Nor would the glorification of our bodies be able to become like Christ’s body contrary to Phil. 3:21.
7. There would be a penetration of dimensions (*penetratio dimensionum*).¹⁷

Objection

1. *Christ sits at the right hand of God; therefore, He is everywhere.*
Reply. To sit at the right hand of God does not refer to place but the highest status and honor under God.

¹⁶ See Chap. 11, pp. 122-123.

¹⁷ This means that two different bodies would be in the same place at the same time.

Controversy 2 – *Does Christ in heaven have a true body and true blood?*
We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Christ in heaven is true man; therefore, He has flesh and blood (Lk. 24:39).
2. *The Son of man* sits at the right hand of God, and He *Himself as such* will come in the clouds; therefore, He has a true body (Mt. 26:64, Lk. 21:27).
3. If he did not have the same body, it could not be said to Him in heaven, “You are the Lamb that was slain, who redeemed us with Your blood,” contrary to Rev. 5:9.
4. Our body becomes like the body of Christ (Phil. 3:21), but we will have flesh and blood (1 Cor. 15:53).
5. He would not be the same Christ unless He had the same body.

Objections

1. *“Flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of heaven”* (1 Cor. 15:50). Reply. As it exists here, with weaknesses and subjected to corruption.
2. *The second Adam is the Lord from heaven, heavenly* (1 Cor. 15:47). Reply. This means He is glorious and incorruptible, as we also will be.
3. *“Food for the stomach and the stomach for food, but God will destroy them both”* (1 Cor. 6:13). Reply. As to the use they have today.

Chapter 13

Conversion and Faith

§I. The words *calling, regeneration, repentance, conversion, and penitence* are sometimes taken *broadly*, and then mean one and the same thing.

At other times, they are taken *strictly*, and thus:

1. *Calling* is the invitation of someone to salvation.
2. *Regeneration* is bringing a dead man to life.
3. *Repentance* is returning to a sound mind.
4. *Conversion* is the change and correction of someone's life.
5. *Penitence* is sorrow over sins committed.

§II. Calling, taken *broadly*, is an act of God by which He leads someone out of a state of sin and into a state of grace by the preaching of the Word and power of the Spirit (Col. 1:12-13).

§III. In this matter, three things are to be distinguished:

1. The external proposition of the duty of man (Acts. 17:30).
2. The intention of God to convert someone (Is. 55:11).
3. Inward change of heart by the Spirit (Jn. 6:44).

§IV. The external calling, or *proposition of duty, promise of reward, and invitation* to the one or the other, certainly comes from the command of God, but it is not properly *the act of God* but of His *Ministers*. However, internal drawing (*tractio interna*) is properly and only the act of God (2 Cor. 4:6-7).

§V. That act of God is called:

1. Regeneration (Jas. 1:18),
2. Creation and making alive (Eph. 2:5),
3. Circumcision of the heart (Dt. 30:6),
4. Giving of a new heart (Ez. 36:26),
5. And drawing (Jn. 6:44).

§VI. The first and proper (*proprium*) effect of this act is the change of the human heart or spiritual life, which is ordinarily called *regeneration*.

§VII. Moreover that regeneration:

1. Occurs in an instant,
2. Is imperfect,
3. And cannot be extinguished (1 Pet. 1:23).

§VIII. But it consists in a change of the whole man, namely, the intellect, will, conscience, affections, abilities (*potentiarum*), and from these, external actions (Eph. 4:24).

§IX. This change takes place in one way in *infants*, where the Spirit alone brings it about, and in another in *adults*, where God uses the law and the Gospel.

§X. In the conversion of a man, the law does these five things:

1. It enjoins duty (Acts 3:19).
2. It shows a need (Matt. 3:10).
3. It convicts of sin (Rom. 3:10).
4. It threatens punishment (2 Cor. 3:6).
5. And by this, it stings and upsets the conscience (Act 2:37).

Therefore, it can be called a tutor unto Christ.

§XI. The Gospel also does these five things:

1. It offers a Mediator (1 Tim. 1:15).
2. It teaches the way in which we become possessors of Him (Mk. 1:15).
3. It promises salvation to anyone who rightly receives the Mediator (Mk. 16:16).
4. It says that God will give both (Heb. 8:10).¹
5. And in this way it gives birth to faith (Gal. 3:2).

Controversy 1 – Are all men called sufficiently to salvation externally, or do all men have the external means sufficient to salvation? *We deny against the Socinians and the Arminians.*

Arguments

1. Not all have either the law or the Gospel (Ps. 147:20); therefore, they do not have sufficient grace for salvation (Rom. 10:14-15).
2. God permitted them to walk in their own ways (Acts 14:16), which were ways of ignorance (Acts 17:30) and darkness (Col. 1:13).
3. And many people were aliens to the covenants of God and without hope of salvation (Eph. 2:12).

¹ This seems to mean that he will give both the Mediator and the right receiving of Him, see Chap. 10, pp. 106-108.

4. God did not will for the Apostles to go and preach in the cities of the Samaritans (Mt. 10:5) or in Asia (Acts 16:7).
5. It contradicts our experience.

Objections

1. *God did not leave Himself without witness (Acts 14:17).* Reply. It was a witness that He existed and was to be worshipped, but this was not sufficient without further instruction to witness how they should worship Him.
2. *What can be known of God is manifest to them (Rom. 1:20).* Reply. Through nature, but this is not sufficient for salvation (Heb. 11:6).

Controversy 2 – *Do all men have sufficient internal grace?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. Those who do not have Christ do not have sufficient grace, but not all have Him (Jn. 15:5, 1 Jn. 5:12).
2. Many are under the dominion and power of the devil and are unable to free themselves (Col. 1:13, 2 Tim. 2:26, 2 Cor. 4:4, Jer. 10:23).
3. Many are spiritually dead (Eph. 2:5, Col. 2:13), but the dead can do nothing.
4. No one is able to come, unless they are effectually drawn (Jn. 6:44-65) and converted (Lam. 5:21); therefore, they do not have sufficient power to come or believe.
5. It is expressly said concerning certain people that they have no power within themselves for doing what is good (Jer. 13:23, Jn. 12:39, 1 Cor. 2:14, Tit. 1:16).

Objections

1. *What more could I do for my vine (Is. 5:4)?* Reply. This does not refer to all or to internal grace. The meaning is that it is to be cut off (v. 5).
2. *They have free will.* Reply. Not for spiritual good.

Controversy 3 – *Are all who are called externally by the Word also called internally by God?* We deny against the same.²

² “This question comes between us and the Lutherans, Arminians, and the patrons of universal grace. They hold that as many as are called by God through the Word are called with God’s intention to save them; otherwise, God would be mocking

Arguments

1. It is given to some to know the mysteries of heaven, but to many it has not been given (Mt. 13:11) but hidden (Mt. 11:25).
2. Many have a veil over their heart and hardened senses (2 Cor. 3:15, Rom. 11:8).
3. If everyone had heard and learned from the Father internally, then all would have come (Jn. 6:45, Is. 55:11), but not all come.
4. Then it would not be necessary to persevere a long time in teaching, "if perhaps God might grant conversion," contrary to 2 Tim. 2:25.

Objections

1. *God calls them externally and so also internally.* Reply. External calling is not an action of God but of man by the commandment of God.
2. *Then external calling is not favor.* Reply. It is because it is a manifestation of the truth. It is favor insofar as the tares grow up with the wheat.
3. *Then God mocks man.* Reply. No, because He does not call them externally, but He only desires for man's duty to be prescribed to him.
4. *Then guilt does not belong to men when they do not listen.* Reply. They are guilty because they do not want to listen (*auscultare*) because of their love for the world and their sins.

Controversy 4 – *Are only the elect called internally?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. Those whom He predestined, He also called. Those whom He called, He also justified (Rom. 8:28).
2. Only the elect listen to and are taught by the Father and come to Christ (Jn. 6:45), but to be taught by and to listen to the Father is internal calling by the Spirit.
3. Only the elect receive the Spirit of regeneration; therefore, they alone are called internally (Gal. 3:2, 5, 4:6; 2 Cor. 3:3).

men and would act hypocritically, not seriously, with men when He offers to them grace that He does not want to give them. Their purpose is to build up universal grace, at least in relation to the preaching of the Gospel in the visible Church," Turretin, *Compendium*, 132.

4. Everyone called internally is saved (Heb. 9:15, Rom. 8:30) because the calling of God is without repentance (11:29).
5. Those who are called in this way are “beloved saints” (Rom. 1:7).

Objections

1. *Many reprobates resist the inward activities of the Holy Spirit (Acts 7:51).* Reply. They are the activities of a conscience convicted of sin not of the Spirit of regeneration.
2. *Many abandon a good conscience (1 Tim. 1:19).* Reply. When they abandon the truth against conscience, they are convicted of it, but this is not the same as the internal calling of the Holy Spirit.

§XII. Conversion is distinguished into *first conversion*, which is the action of God alone and the giving of new life; and *second conversion*, which is the act of man gladly accepting virtue and fleeing sin after he has been regenerated by the Spirit (Lam. 5:21, S. of Sol. 1:4).

§XIII. And this regeneration is the work of Christ:

1. As God;
2. As Mediator, which means
 - a. By His merit (Tit. 2:14).
 - b. According to His image (2 Cor. 3:18).
 - c. By His intercession (Jn. 17:19).
 - d. By His gift as a King and Prophet (Eph. 4:7-8).

Controversy 1 – *Does the will have to be regenerated?* We affirm against the Socinians and the Arminians.

Arguments

1. Because the heart is completely corrupted and a heart of stone (Ez. 36:26, Jer. 13:23).
2. Because virtues must be infused. Love has been poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5).
3. Indeed, there is a new heart (Ps. 51:10).
4. God has to work “a good will in us according to His good pleasure,” not ours (Phil. 2:13; Ps. 8:2, 119:36).

Objections

1. *The essence of the will consists in liberty.* Reply. Naturally for natural things, not supernaturally for supernatural things.

Controversy 2 – *Can the Word of God be heard savingly before conversion?* We deny against the same.³

Arguments

1. An unregenerate man does not perceive the things of the Spirit of God, nor can he (1 Cor. 2:14).
2. The Gospel is not the power for salvation except for the one who believes (Rom. 1:16, 1 Cor. 1:24, 1 Pet. 2:7).
3. If the Word is to be heard unto salvation, God must open the heart (Acts 16:14).
4. No one can say that Jesus is Lord, except by the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3); therefore, they cannot hear the Word unto salvation.
5. Hearing does not save, unless God gives conversion inwardly (2 Tim. 2:25).
6. All preaching and hearing of the Word is vain, unless God gives the increase (2 Cor. 3:6-7, 9).

Objections

1. *Why, then, is it preached to them?* Reply. If perhaps God desires to make use of those means for their conversion (2 Tim. 2:25), as was said before, “Lazarus, come forth!”
2. *It is the means of regeneration.* Reply. Morally; therefore, nothing can happen before regeneration.

§XIV. There are therefore no inclinations toward regeneration:

1. In infants.
2. In adults there are *none from man*.
3. Nor from God before the beginning of life.

But in adults:

1. There are occasions of regeneration, such as the hearing of the Word in Acts 16:14.
2. There are preparations leading to second conversion, which is the firm resolution of a man to amend his life as in Acts 2:37.

Controversy 1 – *Is the whole action of God in the conversion of man nothing but moral action, namely, His illumination and persuasion by the Word?* We deny. *Or does God infuse new life by a spiritual and physical action?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.

³ That is, can someone who is not converted hear the Word of God, believe, and be saved? This is a question of whether first conversion must precede second conversion as in §XII, p. 148.

Arguments

1. To give a new heart, regenerate, and raise the dead are not *moral* but *physical* actions. But God does these things in the conversion of man (Ez. 36, Jn. 3:3, Eph. 2).
2. Otherwise, besides the proposition of the Word, no other action of God would be required contrary to 1 Cor. 3:6-7, 9; 2 Tim. 2:25.
3. God is said to “powerfully draw man” and work faith and a good will in him (Jn. 6:44, Eph. 1:19, Phil. 2:13), which is to work physically.
4. Then man would make himself to differ contrary to 1 Cor. 4:7.
5. Then God would have done nothing more in preserving Judas than in preserving Peter, since He persuaded both in the same way, contrary to Mt. 18:11.

Objections

1. *God commands and persuades unto repentance.* Reply. Externally, but internally He works effectually.
2. *Then God is guilty, since many are not converted.* Reply. No. He certainly owes grace to no one and especially not to those who do not want to be converted.

Controversy 2 – *Is the work of converting grace irresistible? In other words, does God work conversion in man in such a way and by such a power that someone cannot and does not want to hinder it?* We affirm against the Arminians.

Arguments

1. A man is neither willing nor able to resist except by a heart of stone, but this is taken away in conversion (Jer. 31:33, Ez. 36:26).
2. God regenerates us by the same power by which He raises the dead (Eph. 1:19, Col. 1:13, 2 Thes. 2:11), but the dead cannot impede their own resurrection.
3. God not only works an ability (*potentiam*) to believe but also a will and faith itself; therefore, they cannot and do not want to hinder it (Phil. 1:29, 2:13, Eph. 2:8), for they have a different ability (*potentiam*) and a different spirit (*animum*).
4. The conversion of someone is a new birth and raising of the dead; therefore, no one can hinder conversion any more than someone could resist his birth or a dead man his raising (Jn. 3:3, 25, Eph. 2:5).
5. If someone could hinder it, then he would always hinder it, because by nature he hates the good (Rom. 8:7, Col. 1:21).

6. If someone can resist his conversion, then every counsel of God could be frustrated contrary to Eph. 1:11, and God could fail in foreknowledge contrary to Acts 15:18.

Objections

1. *God seriously desired to convert many who have not been converted (Is. 65:2-3).* Reply. This is done according to external means and not by the internal action of God, as likewise in the other passages where this same objection is often made (Lk. 7:30, Acts 7:51, Prov. 1:24, etc.).
2. *They have eyes to see but do not see (Ez. 12:2).* Reply. They had eyes to see the terrible things with which they were threatened. This certainly does not refer to the grace of conversion.
3. *God desires the conversion of those who are not willing to be converted (Ps. 81:13).* Reply. It says, "Oh, if they would be obedient to Me!" It would certainly be for their greatest happiness.
4. *Then conversion is not an act of obedience.* Reply. *First* conversion is a gift of God not an act of obedience, but, *second* conversion is.

Controversy 3 – *Is man in the first act of regeneration merely passive? We affirm against the Socinians and the Arminians.*⁴

Arguments

1. Every dead man is passive in resurrection, but this is man's condition in regeneration (Eph. 2:5, Col. 2:13).
2. Whoever is regenerated is insensible to any good (2 Cor. 3:5); therefore, He cannot be anything but passive.
3. If he were active, he would be active by a good heart, but in the first act of regeneration a new heart is given to him (Ez. 36:26).
4. If he were active, he would make himself to differ contrary to 1 Cor. 4:7, and God would not have begun a good work in him contrary to Phil. 1:6 and Rom. 10:20.

Objections

1. *Then a man is no different than a piece of wood.* Reply. He is truly a rational creature, but he is dead in sin.

⁴ "This question exists between us and the Papists, Socinians, Arminians, and other Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. They maintain a certain synergism and cooperation with the grace of God so as not to take away free will. This is why they are called Synergists," Turretin, *Compendium*, 136.

2. *We are coworkers with God (1 Cor. 3:9)*. Reply. This refers to ministers, who are called coworkers in relation to the preaching of the Gospel.
3. *God only assists (Rom. 8:26)*. Reply. This refers to the converted not to those who are to be converted.
4. *Then there is no praise due to someone who converts*. Reply. All glory for the first act of conversion is owed to God.

Controversy 4 – *Is the grace of God efficacious only because God offers it at such times and places and in those circumstances in which He knows whether it will be received by persuasion (which they call congruent calling)?* We deny against the Papists and Arminians.⁵

Arguments

1. Then conversion would be wholly of the one who wills and the one who runs contrary to Rom. 9:16 and 1 Cor. 4:7.
2. God converts someone, place and time do not (2 Tim. 2:25).
3. He who converts someone by efficacious working does not do it by congruent persuasion (Eph. 1:19).
4. Then a man would come by his own powers; he would not be drawn contrary to Jn. 6:44.
5. Then the whole blame for man not converting would be that God does not call him at the proper time and place.

Controversy 5 – *Does the grace of God determine the will itself to its actions?* We affirm against the Papists and Arminians.

Arguments

1. God by His own good pleasure gives believing itself and willing itself (Phil. 1:29, 2:13), and He works good in them (Heb. 13:21).
2. God completes powerfully every good pleasure (*benepiacitum*) of His goodness and the work of faith (2 Thes. 1:11, Col. 1:10).
3. That is why believers pray that God would soften and bend their hearts (Ps. 86:11, 119:36, S. of Sol. 1:4).

⁵ “The Papists hold to three different views on the doctrine of effectual calling. The first is that of Molina, Lessius, and Becanus who want it to be called ‘efficacious’ simply from the event. The second is that of Bellarmine, Suarez, and others who deduce its efficacy from its congruity. The third is that of the Thomists and Dominicans who seek it in physical predetermination,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 137. Here he contends with second.

4. That is why it is said to be given to believers to grow (Ps. 92:14, Jn. 15:16, 1 Cor. 3:6) and why God is said to have prepared good works for them (Eph. 2:10).
5. Unless God determined the will, His foreknowledge and predestination would be uncertain, along with everything else.

Objections

1. *Then all of man's free will perishes.* Reply. No. Man is free as a second cause not as the first cause.
2. *Then the desire for good works is taken away.* Reply. No, it increases the desire of always having the help of God.

§XV. Faith is a spiritual virtue, by which a man accepts the whole word of God as a rule of life and Christ as Savior (Jn. 1:12, 3:33).

§XVI. To the question, "Does faith precede penitence?" we reply: the faith by which we believe God to exist, that virtue is to be desired, and ourselves to be sinners worthy of eternal death precedes repentance; but the faith by which we receive Christ as Mediator follows penitence (Acts 2:37).

§XVII. In this justifying faith, three things should be carefully distinguished:

1. The consent of the soul, receiving Christ as Surety and Lord by agreement (*contractu*).
2. From this consent arises an assent that Christ is now ours.
3. And on account of these we place all trust (*fiducia*) in Him (Jn. 1:12, Gal. 2:20).

§XVIII. Nor is it necessary to place this faith either in the intellect or the will because ability to believe anything is a distinct power [*potentia distincta*] of the soul.

Controversy 1 – *Is love the form of faith, or does faith consist in obedience to the commandments of God?* We deny against the Papists and Socinians.⁶

⁶ "The Papists distinguish faith into formed and unformed that they might establish faith as in itself not justifying but borrowing its whole power to justify from love...The Socinians...want faith to be nothing but obedience to the commandments of God so that good works are not so much the fruit of faith as its form," Turretin, *Compendium*, 140.

Arguments

1. They are distinct virtues (1 Cor. 13:13).
2. They are opposed in justification: “not by works, but by faith” (Rom. 3:28).
3. Faith is the cause of love and works (Gal. 5:6, 1 Tim. 1:5).

Objections

1. *This is the faith by which we please God (Heb. 11:6).* Reply. Faith produces obedience, but it is not obedience.
2. *The opposite of faith is disobedience (Jn. 3:36).* Reply. Disobedience is opposed to every virtue and so also to faith.
3. *Faith is perfect by works (James 2:22).* Reply. Therefore it is distinct from works but shows its perfection in this, that it produces works.

Controversy 2 – *Does faith also require knowledge of the thing believed?*
We affirm against the Papists.⁷

Arguments

1. Ignorance in believers is rebuked as a vice (1 Cor. 14:20). Knowledge is commanded (Col. 3:16).
2. Everyone who believes ought to know in whom and what he believes (2 Tim. 1:12, Is. 53:11, Jn. 17:3).
3. Faith comes from hearing and understanding the Word of God (Rom. 10:17); therefore, it is not without knowledge.
4. The believer ought to be able to give a confession of his faith and a reason for his faith (1 Pet. 3:15, Rom. 10:10).

Objections

1. *Knowledge is distinguished from faith (1 Cor. 13:2).* Reply. This refers to the faith of miracles.⁸ 2. And knowledge is distinguished but not separated from faith.

⁷ “The Papists say that they believe many things by an implicit faith that suffices for the laity that they may more easily subject the people to themselves through a blind obedience,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 141.

⁸ “The faith of miracles is distinguished into active or passive, and it is a persuasion of a miracle to be performed either by us or in us...neither one is necessarily connected with salvation,” Johannes à Marck, *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, XXII.6.

2. *Faith believes by the testimony of a witness.* Reply. Therefore, he understands what is testified to him.
3. *Faith is a step to knowledge.* Reply. This is conceded concerning knowledge from experience.
4. *We must take our thought captive (2 Cor. 10:5).* Reply. Insofar as we give assent to those things that are explained to us in the Word of God.

Controversy 3 – *Does faith also require trust (fiducia) or a firm persuasion of the soul that the promises of the Gospel pertain to us in Christ?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. This is commanded in the command of faith, “let us receive with confidence (*fiducia*)” (Mt. 9:2, 22, Heb. 10:22).
2. It is praised and commended by examples (Rom. 4:3, 2 Cor. 5:1, Gal. 2:20, 2 Tim. 4:8, 1 Jn. 3:2).
3. And lack of trust is rebuked (Mt. 14:31, Jas. 1:6).
4. Otherwise faith cannot work peace of conscience and joy contrary to Rom. 8:1, 1 Pet. 1:8.

Objections

1. *Faith in the Person and Deity of Christ justifies; therefore, trust (fiducia) is not required (Mk. 16:16, Rom. 10:9).* Reply. When one part is mentioned, another is not excluded.
2. *Trust (fiducia) is an effect of faith (Eph. 3:12).* Reply. But they are joined. It is an effect of that faith by which I receive Christ as my Mediator.
3. *Trust (fiducia) is hope.* Reply. It is a common adjunct of hope and faith (Heb. 6:18-19).
4. *There was trust (fiducia) in that ungodly Pharisee (Lk. 18).* Reply. Not trust (*fiducia*) but presumption.

Controversy 4 – *Can true faith be without love and good works?* We deny against the Papists.⁹

⁹ “For true faith cannot be separated from love, nor should love constitute the form of faith, and the Papists do both,” Johannes à Marck, *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, XXII.26.

Arguments

1. Faith cleanses the heart (Acts. 15:9) and produces love (Gal. 5:6, 1 Tim. 1:5).
2. Where there is no love, there true faith is said not to be (James 2:20, 26). “He who says ‘I know Him,’ and does not do His commandments is a liar” (1 Jn. 2:4).
3. Faith compels believers unto good works (2 Cor. 5:14-15; Ps. 103:1-2). “God remains in whoever confesses Jesus to be the Son of God, and the one who confesses remains in God” (1 Jn. 4:16).
4. Through faith, we are grafted into Christ (Eph. 3:12), but whoever is in Christ brings forth fruit (Jn. 15:5, 2 Cor. 5:17).

Objections

1. *They believed in Christ but loved the esteem of man more than the esteem of God (Jn. 12:42-43).* Reply. That faith was only an historical faith by which they believed Christ to be the promised Messiah.
2. *If I have faith and have not love... (1 Cor. 13:2).* Reply. This refers to the faith of miracles.¹⁰
3. *If someone says that he has faith but does not have works (Jas. 2:14).* Reply. If someone says this, he says it falsely, as the Apostle mentions in the same passage (v. 17).

Controversy 5 – *Can a believer be certain of his faith, repentance, remission of sins, and salvation?* We affirm against the Papists.¹¹

Arguments

1. Each one can know what is in his own heart (1 Cor. 2:11). We know that we have been regenerated (1 Jn. 3:14).
2. Believers are warned that they should make themselves more certain of their faith and salvation (2 Cor. 13:5, 2 Pet. 1:10).

¹⁰ See n. 8, p. 154.

¹¹ “The Council of Trent in Sess. 6, 9, 13, and 14 denies ‘that anyone can know with the certainty of faith, in which there can be nothing false, that he has obtained the grace of God.’ It denies that ‘those who are truly justified should determine for themselves without any doubt at all that they are justified.’ The Arminians fear lest such certainty bring about a careless security. They say that it is commendable and useful to doubt whether we will always be what we now are. Instead, they establish only a conditional security by which believers know that if they persevere in faith they will remain in the grace of God,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 142-143.

3. The Spirit testifies with their spirit that they are sons of God (Rom. 8:16, 2 Cor. 1:22).
4. Signs are given by which we can be certain of our faith (1 Jn. 4:13, 2:29).

Objections

1. *It is not found in the Word of God that my sins have been forgiven.* Reply. It is found in the heart from the Word of God, just as it is not found that *I* am a sinner.
2. *The heart is deceitful, who can know it (Jer. 17:9)?* Reply. Both God and man can know a man's own heart (Lk. 12:57).
3. *Why then do we ask for remission of sins?* Reply. Why do we ask for life? We ask that we might remain in that state.
4. *No one can say, "I am pure" (Prov. 20:9).* Reply. Pure is perfect, which no one is.

Controversy 6 – *Is faith is a permanent disposition (habitus), not only an act?* We affirm against the Arminians.

Arguments

1. It is infused and given by the Spirit; therefore, it is a disposition (Eph. 2:8, 2 Cor. 4:13).
2. Faith remains in man, and this is a characteristic of a disposition (Jn. 15:4).
3. It is the origin (*principium*) of works (Gal. 5:6, 22; 2 Cor. 5:7).
4. It is a virtue, but every virtue is a disposition (1 Cor. 13:13, 1 Tim. 6:11).
5. It has its gradations, increases, and decreases; therefore, it is a disposition (Rom. 12:3, Col. 1:23).
6. Otherwise, when a man sleeps, he would not have faith.

Controversy 6 (II) – *Are there infused dispositions (habitus), and is faith such a disposition?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. Love is an infused disposition; therefore, faith is also (Rom. 5:5).
2. Faith is given to us through the indwelling Spirit; therefore, it is an infused disposition (2 Cor. 4:13).
3. It is given in an instant, which is a characteristic of infused dispositions (Acts 11:17, 16:34).
4. Otherwise it could not be called a gift of God and of the Holy Spirit.

Objections

1. *Faith is commanded, but no infused disposition can be commanded.*
Reply. When the law commands all holiness, it commands also that we have faith, both habitual and actual.
2. *A disposition can no more be intensified than life.* Reply. 1. Life can also be intensified (*intendi*). Someone can be livelier (*vivacior*) than someone else. 2. Life is not properly an infused disposition but the subject of every disposition.

Controversy 7 – *Is faith prescribed in the Decalogue?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. The Decalogue commands a man to have God as his God and therefore also that he have faith in Him.
2. Otherwise, the Jews would not have sinned who did not believe God contrary to Ps. 78:22, 32; Is. 7:9.
3. It was commanded to Adam that he have faith in God; and this was repeated in the Decalogue.
4. The law commands everyone to do everything well; therefore, it also commands that we do them by faith (Rom. 14:23).

Objections

1. *An act of the intellect is not subject to the divine law.* Reply. This was refuted above,¹² for knowledge of God is commanded.

¹² In Chap. 9, pp. 89-90.

Chapter 14

On Justification

§I. Justification is the gracious sentence of God by which He acquits a believer from punishment and grants to him a right to eternal life.

§II. This sentence is pronounced:

1. In the word of God (Acts 13:38).
2. In Christ as Surety (Is. 50:8).
3. In the conscience of believers (Rom. 5:1).
4. At the last judgment (Rom. 3:26).

Controversy – *Does the word to justify in the topic of justification mean to infuse holiness or to acquit from guilt?* We deny the former and affirm the latter against the Papists.

Arguments

1. It is unlawful to justify the ungodly (Ex. 23:7, Prov. 17:15), but it would be permitted, if to justify meant to make holy.
2. Things are said to be justified that are not capable of being made holy such as God (Luke 7:29) and His wisdom (Matt. 11:19).
3. It is the opposite of condemning someone to death (Rom. 8:33-4).
4. The ungodly who justify themselves are rebuked (Luke 16:15), but they would not be rebuked if to justify meant to sanctify.
5. Justification is not by works (Rom. 3:28), but it would be entirely by works, if to justify meant to sanctify.

Objections

1. “*Knowledge justifies*” (Is. 53:11). Reply. No, but Christ through His own knowledge and through faith in Him leads believers to a state of justification (Lk. 1:77).
2. “*Pastors justify many*” (Dan. 12:3). Reply. As Ministers acquitting in the name of God. The meaning of the text is that they lead others to a state of justification.
3. “*The dead are justified*” (Rom. 6:7). Reply. They certainly are justified, and they are certainly acquitted.

4. “*He who is righteous let him be righteous still*” (Rev. 22:11). Reply. This means: let him remain in that state. Every righteous man ought to be justified daily in the Word of God and in their own conscience. “Forgive us our debts.”
5. *To justify means to make just*. Reply. No more than to magnify (*magnificare*) means to make great (*magnum facere*).

§III. Justification, therefore, means to declare righteous:

1. Whether it is by a judge,
2. A friend,
3. Or oneself.

And therefore to justify sometimes means to acquit from *guilt* (Ex. 23:7), sometimes to *praise as righteous* (Luke 7:29), and sometimes to *show to be righteousness* (Job. 32:2).

§IV. In order that justification might be properly understood, the following should be carefully observed:

1. God is sitting on His throne as judge (Ps. 9:4).
2. Believers have been cited and accused (Rev. 20:11-12).
3. The devil is the accuser (Zech. 3:1).
4. Jesus Christ is the intercessor, showing that He has satisfied for believers (1 John 2:1-2).
5. God acquits believers on account of that satisfaction (Rom. 8:33).

And this is properly justification.

§V. The *principal cause* of justification is the Triune God (2 Cor. 5:19). The *internal moving cause* is the grace of God (Rom. 3:24). The *external cause* is the righteousness of Christ (2 Cor. 5:21). The *material cause*, or that which is imputed to us, is the same as the external cause, the righteousness of Christ (Phil. 3:9). The *formal cause* is the judicial acquittal (*abjudicatio*) from punishment and the judicial granting (*adjudicatio*) of life (Rom. 8:33). The *instrumental cause* is faith (Rom. 5:1). The *final cause* is the glory of God and our salvation (Rom. 3:25).

§VI. The effects are:

1. Adoption (Tit. 3:7).
2. Peace of conscience (Rom. 5:1).
3. The hope of eternal life, etc.

§VII. Justification is distinguished into active and passive. Active is the general sentence of God by which He acquits all believers on account of the righteousness of Christ at the same time. This occurs in paradise

and by promise (Gen. 3:15), in Christ the Head (2 Cor. 5:19), and in His Word (Rom. 8:1).¹

§VIII. But passive is the particular justification of each believer:

1. In his *person* when Christ is given to him,
2. In his *conscience* after the act of faith (Rom. 5:1), which also is often repeated.

§IX. *Active* justification precedes our faith and sanctification; *passive* justification follows.

§X. Consequently, there is in God a *will not to punish sin* before a person believes, as in the example of Paul, but he, as to his person, remains under guilt until he receives Christ by faith.

§XI. The effect of justification is a change, *not in a person substantively (realis)*, but *morally (moralis)*² and in *status*. He acquires a right to eternal life.

§XII. The believer has this right on account of the *mediatorial righteousness* of Christ that has been acquired by His *active* and *passive* obedience. God gives this righteousness to man, and man receives it by faith.

§XIII. This faith is here a *consent of the soul* and not a bare *assent of the mind*, by which man enters into a covenant and pact with Christ, receives Him as Mediator and for his righteousness and commits himself to Christ to be saved by Him.

§XIV. When a believer has been constituted in a state of grace in this way, he remains in it his whole life and cannot perish.

Controversy 1 – *Is there, in addition to sanctification, a gift of justification, by which God acquits believers from punishment and grants to them a right to eternal life?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. They are listed as two distinct gifts (1 Cor. 6:11).

¹ For more on the distinction of active and passive justification, see Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 555-559.

² “The physical entity of sin is not taken away, but the moral being is taken away, the power in it to condemn the soul,” Edward Leigh, *Body of Divinity*, 719.

2. Justification results in no one being able to bring a charge against believers; therefore, it is distinguished from sanctification (Rom. 8:33).
3. Christ's declaration, "Your sins are forgiven you," was altogether different from sanctification (Mt. 9:2).
4. Justification is completed in this life in the same moment that someone believes, but sanctification is not (Rom. 5:1, Lk. 18:14).
5. Justification is the sentence of God acquitting someone (Rom. 8:1), but sanctification is not.

Objections

1. *They are one and the same (1 Cor. 6:11).* Reply. They are listed as separate.
2. *Justification is the washing away of sins; therefore...* Reply. Not by the Holy Spirit but by the blood and merit of Christ by which He blots out our debts (1 Jn. 1:7).
3. *We become new creatures by the grace of justification (Eph. 2:10).* Reply. On the contrary, this is done substantively (*realiter*) in sanctification, but it can be said to be done morally (*moraliter*) and in relation to status in justification.
4. *The grace of justification is an indwelling (inherens) gift (Rom. 5:17).* Reply. It is said to be a gift because it is given freely. It is not called an "indwelling (*inherens*) gift" or "our holiness."

Controversy 2 – *Is someone justified on account of his own inherent righteousness?* We deny against the Papists.³

Arguments

1. A man is not justified by *his* righteousness (Rom. 10:3, Phil. 3:9).
2. He is not justified by the law (Rom. 3:20, Gal. 3:11).
3. Not by works (Rom. 3:28, Gal. 2:16).
4. A man is justified completely by grace (Rom. 3:24).
5. Our righteousness is imperfect; therefore, we cannot truly be declared righteous on account of it (Is. 64:6).
6. Justification takes away from man all occasion for boasting (Rom. 3:27).

³ "We are not referring here to legal justification. We confess that in that case inherent righteousness would be the meritorious cause, and that no one can obtain it without perfect obedience. But now, since the law is made weak through sin, this method of justification is impossible. Consequently, we refer here to Gospel justification, which is proposed to us in the covenant of grace. We deny that this justification is founded on inherent righteousness," Turretin, *Compendium*, 146.

7. We are justified by the blood and merit of Christ; therefore, we are not justified by our own righteousness (Eph. 1:7).

Objections

1. *“Your sins are forgiven you, for you loved much” (Luke 7:47).* Reply. “For” does not indicate an effecting cause but a connection just as “the sun is risen, for it is day.”
2. *“We are justified by grace” (Rom. 3:24).* Reply. By the grace of God, not by an indwelling grace in us.
3. *“The doers of the law will be justified” (Rom. 2:13).* Reply. They would be justified by the law, if they were doers of the law, but because none are, all must be justified by grace.
4. *We are constituted righteous through Christ just as through Adam we are constituted unrighteous, but this has been done inherently (Rom. 5:17).* Reply. All of this is conceded. For as the sin of Adam is imputed to us and we are also sinners on this basis, so we are absolved by the righteousness of Christ and regenerated by His Spirit.
5. *Penitence justifies (Acts 2:38).* Reply. Sins are remitted to the penitent but not on account of our repentance.
6. *Abraham was justified as a result (ex) of works (James 2:21).* Reply. This means he was not justified by faith, which was not without works but was effective (*efficax*) through works.

Controversy 3 – *Are the satisfaction and righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and are we justified on account of their imputation to us?* We affirm against the Socinians, Papists, and Arminians.

Arguments

1. Because Christ is said to be our righteousness before God (Jer. 23:6, Phil. 3:9, 1 Cor. 1:30).
2. We have been constituted righteous through His obedience just as we were constituted unrighteous through the disobedience of Adam (Rom. 5:18-19), but this has been done by imputation.
3. As our sins have been imputed to Christ, so His righteousness is imputed to us (2 Cor. 5:21).
4. Whatever Christ performed for us as our surety ought necessarily to be imputed to us. He performed righteousness for us (1 Tim. 2:6, Gal. 4:4); therefore...
5. On account of Christ and His blood our sins are remitted; therefore, His obedience ought to be imputed to us (Rom. 5:9, Gal. 3:13, 1 Jn. 1:7).

Objections

1. *Then we are just as righteous as Christ.* Reply. No. For the righteousness of Christ is given to us not as something that dwells (*inhaereat*) in our essence but as to the power and efficacy of His satisfaction.
2. *Then our sins are only covered not taken away.* Reply. They are taken away as to dominion in sanctification, but as to the power to condemn in justification.
3. *Then our sins were properly (proprie) imputed to Christ.* Reply. More properly, that which had the power of meriting punishment. Objection. *Then Christ had to be a son of the devil.* Reply. By no means, for that comes from the indwelling (*inhaerente*) dominion of sin.
4. *No one can be constituted righteous by the righteousness of another.* Reply. The righteousness of another cannot make someone inherently righteous, but by the payment of another someone can be released from debt.
5. *The judgment of God is not according to truth, if He judges to be righteous those who are not righteous.* Reply. God does not judge us to be righteous in justification, meaning perfectly sanctified, but we cannot be condemned since Christ has made satisfaction for us.
6. *We are justified freely (Rom. 3:24).* Reply. Inasmuch as we do not pay anything.

Controversy 4 – *Is only Christ’s passive obedience or death imputed to us or also His active obedience and keeping of the whole law?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. What Christ has paid for us ought to be imputed to us, but He paid active righteousness for us (Gal. 4:4-5, John 17:19).
2. Christ fulfilled *the whole law* for the justification of everyone who believes (Rom. 8:3, 10:4).
3. The law never promised blessedness (*beatitatem*) to passive obedience but only to active: “Do this, and you will live” (Gal. 3:12); therefore, he had to do this in order that He might acquire for us a right to life.
4. Nor is there any other righteousness than that which can be said to be imputed to us as it is in Rom. 4:6 and Jer. 23:6.
5. We are justified by the obedience of the Mediator (Rom. 5:19), but obedience is not merely passive but chiefly active.

6. Unless it is imputed to us, we would still be obligated to pay it to acquire a right to life, for the law cannot be broken (John 10:35).
7. It is a cloak of righteousness with which Christ clothes us (Zech. 3:4-5, Phil. 3:9, Is. 61:10).

Objections

1. *It is constantly ascribed to His death and blood.* Reply. Because it was the completion and fulfillment of all the obedience of Christ.
2. *By the death of Christ all of our sins are taken away, including those of omission; therefore, a right to life has been acquired by His death.* Reply. By His death our sins are blotted out, in as much as they are worthy of punishment, but this does not supply what was lacking for the fulfillment of the covenant of works: "Do this, and you will live."
3. *Christ owed active obedience for Himself.* Reply. On the contrary, it was the obedience of a surety, and before His advent into the world, it had been contracted that He would fulfill it for us.
4. *Then we are not held to active obedience, since Christ has fulfilled it for us.* Reply. We are not held to righteousness contractually, so that by it we might acquire a right to life, but only for gratitude.
5. *Then His death was superfluous, or He has paid twice.* Reply. He has not, since both active and passive obedience were to be paid.
6. *The whole of justification is found in remission of sins (Rom. 4:6-7).* Reply. No, a right to life is also been acquired (Rom. 8:3).

Controversy 5 – *Are we, then, justified by faith alone as an instrument?*
We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. We are justified by faith without works (Rom. 3:28).
2. We are only justified by faith (Gal. 2:16, Luke 8:50).
3. God justifies the ungodly who believe in and flee to Christ; therefore, it is by faith alone (Rom. 4:5).
4. Justification is without the law. It is not, "do this and you will live"; therefore, it is by faith alone (Rom. 3:21-22, Gal. 3:11-12).
5. Unless it was by faith alone, it would not be by grace (Rom. 4:16).
6. We receive Christ by faith alone (John 1:12, Eph. 3:12, 17).

Objections

1. *Then good works are not necessary.* Reply. Not that we might acquire a right to life but as commanded by God and as works of gratitude.

2. *Faith does not justify separated from other virtues (reliquis virtutibus); therefore it is not by faith alone.* Reply. Even if faith is not alone, it acts alone, just as the eyes are not alone, although they alone see.
3. *Through faith alone we do not please God; therefore...* Reply. In justification, we certainly do please God by faith alone.
4. *Faith justifies insofar as it cleanses the heart (Acts 15:9).* Reply. It cleanses the heart, inasmuch as by an instrument it applies to itself the blood of Christ.

Controversy 6 – *Is faith itself either alone or with love accepted by God as our righteousness?* We deny against the Arminians.⁴

Arguments

1. It is with faith as it is with all the works of the law. “Do this and live” is excluded (Rom. 3:28, Gal. 3:12).
2. The judgment of God is according to truth (Rom. 2:2); therefore, He cannot accept faith as the complete fulfillment of the law.
3. We are justified by the blood and merit of Christ (Rom. 3:24, Eph. 1:7, Gal. 3:13); therefore, our faith is not imputed to us as our righteousness.
4. God in justification shows himself to be just (Rom. 3:25, 26), but this would not be the case if faith were accepted as observance of the whole law.
5. Then Christ would have died in vain, for then we would be able to stand before the face of God by our own righteousness contrary to Galatians 2:21.

Objection

1. *His faith is imputed to him for righteousness (Rom. 4:5).* Reply. In other words, faith justifies, but it justifies as an instrument receiving the merit of Christ.

⁴ “We are not inquiring here whether faith justifies. For the Scripture so clearly asserts it that no one would deny it. We are inquiring here as to the mode in which it justifies. The Socinians hold that faith or the act of believing is the cause of our justification, so that the formal and immediate righteousness by which we are justified before God is nothing else than our faith. They do not think that faith in itself has the power to bring about righteousness and life, but they think that it is such because of God’s gracious acceptance of that faith as the perfect righteousness,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 152.

Controversy 7 – *Were Old Testament believers truly justified, and did they have complete remission of sins?* We affirm against the Socinians and Arminians.

Arguments

1. Holy Scripture everywhere testifies that their sins were forgiven (Ps. 32:5-6, 65:4, 103:3, 12; Is. 6:7, 63:25; etc.).
2. God clearly promised forgiveness of sins to those who believed and repented (2 Chron. 7:14, Is. 1:18, 55:7, Heb. 2:4).
3. With faith they asked for forgiveness of sins (1 Kings 8:50, Ps. 25:11, 18, 51:3, 4, 9); therefore, they have been heard.
4. They were saved and received into glory (Ps. 68:20, 73:24); therefore, their sins had been forgiven. The consequent is proved from Psalm 32:1 and Romans 6:7.⁵
5. God was their God forever (*in aeternum*) (Ps. 48:14), and the Lord Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8); therefore, their sins have been forgiven through Christ.
6. They had the sacraments and signs of the remission of sins (Rom. 4:11).
7. They were fully justified (Rom. 4:2ff., Gal. 3:6), but there is no justification without the remission of sins (Acts 13:38).

Objections

1. *Through the law of Moses they could not be justified from their sins (Acts 13:38-39).* Reply. Indeed, not *through the law of Moses*, but *under the law of Moses through the grace of Christ*.
2. *God promises remission of sins as something future in the New Testament (Jer. 31:31).* Reply. 1. It was not future to the believers of the Old Testament but to those of the New. 2. Remission means either the satisfaction of the Mediator or the acquittal of the judge. The former was promised, and the latter was given.
3. *Christ by His blood atoned for sins in the Old Testament (Heb. 9:15).* Reply. Then “atonement” is an act of the Mediator by which He satisfies not of a judge by which He acquits.
4. *They only had a passing over (paresis) or disregarding (dissimulatio) of sins (Rom. 3:25).* Reply. Passing over (*paresis*) and forgiveness (*aphesis*) mean the same thing (Mc. 7:18-19, Heb. 9:22).
5. *Where there is remission of sins, no further sacrifice is required (Heb. 10:10).* Reply. This has already been answered. The words to remit or to atone sometimes denote the actions of the Mediator

⁵ Perhaps Rom. 4:7.

or the satisfaction itself. When this had been performed, no other sacrifice was required.

Controversy 8 – *Was God able to demand payment from the fathers of the Old Testament for their sins and punish them on account of their sins? We deny against the same.*

1. He had promised that He would not do it (Ps. 50:8, Is. 43:25), but He was not able to lie (Tit. 1:1).
2. Indeed, He had testified by an express oath that He would not change the covenant (Ps. 89:3-4, 34-36), in which it was impossible that He would lie (Heb. 6:18).
3. He had imputed all things to the Mediator (Is. 53:6) who also had accepted them by a solemn contract (Ps. 40:7-8).
4. He had given to them *actio cessa*,⁶ as they say, and confirmed it with signs of the covenant that what they owed would be exacted from the Mediator and not from them (Rom. 4:11); therefore, He cannot do otherwise.
5. They were blessed in heaven, from whence they could not be dislodged into hell.
6. He has revealed that it is impossible (Is. 49:15ff). “A mother of an infant might forget her child, but I will not forget you.”

Objections

1. *It was a yearly reminder of sins (Heb. 10:3).* Reply. These were pointing to the Messiah to come. The sins of believers were assigned to Him, and thus payment for those sins cannot be demanded from them.
2. *Christ had not yet satisfied.* Reply. This obligated Christ not believers, and it does not imply any difference in God before whom the lamb has been slain from the foundation of world.

Controversy 9 – *Is it possible, then, for truly regenerated sons of God to fall away totally and finally from faith, from the grace of God, and from remission of sins? We deny against the Papists, Socinians, Arminians, and Lutherans.*

⁶ This is a certificate indicating that a creditor had ceded his right to receive payment from someone. The certificate was given to the debtor.

Arguments

1. It is expressly said that it is impossible for the devil, sins, or seducers to prevail against the regenerated sons of God (Mt. 16:18, 24:24, Rom. 6:14).
2. The grace of God, once infused into the hearts of the elect, is said to be such that its efficacy never withers (Ps. 1:3, 92:13ff, Jn. 4:14, 1 Pet. 1:23).
3. God promised in the covenant of grace that He will insure that believers will not fall away (Jer. 32:39-40, Is. 14:10, Phil. 1:6).
4. And therefore He powerfully preserves them to such an extent that no one is able to snatch them away from Him (Jn. 10:28ff., 1 Cor. 1:8, 2 Thess. 3:3, 1 Pet. 1:5).
5. Nor can He do otherwise, because the election of God and the gifts on account of it are unchangeable (Rom. 8:30, 11:29, 2 Tim. 2:19).
6. Since the will of the Father and the Son is perpetual, so that all those given to the Mediator will be saved and nothing lost (Jn. 6:37, 39).
7. But those who abandon the profession of the truth show themselves to have never truly been believers (Jn. 8:31, 1 Jn. 2:19).

Objections

1. *“If a righteous man falls away...” (Ez. 18:24).* Reply. It is not said what will be but that which would be if he should fall away in terms of the covenant of works.
2. *“When persecution comes, they are scandalized” (Mt. 13:20-21).* Reply. This does not refer to justifying but historical faith. For it is said that “he has no root in himself,” (v. 21), and he is distinguished from the one who is on good soil (v. 23).
3. *Those who tasted the heavenly gift and have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit became apostates (Heb. 6:4).* Reply. These people were convicted of the truth of the Christian religion *in their conscience* but not regenerated *in their hearts*.
4. *“If after they have escaped the world, they fall back” (2 Pet. 2:19-20).* Reply. These are not sheep and true believers but are called “pigs” and “dogs” (v. 22). By profession and promise they had said goodbye to the world but not in their soul.
5. *David and Solomon fell away.* Reply. They slipped but did not completely fall away (Ps. 73:24).
6. *Demas (1 Tim. 4:10).* Reply. He therefore was never a true believer.
7. *Then why are there exhortations and warnings?* Reply. They are means by which God preserves someone from destruction.

Chapter 15

The Decalogue and Good Works

§I. Sanctification differs from justification in these ways:

1. Justification is a legal act, but sanctification is physical and substantive act (*realis*).
2. Justification takes place for the most part outside of man in the Word of God and in Christ, but sanctification takes place in man.
3. Justification only brings about a moral change and a change of status, but sanctification brings about a substantive (*realis*) change and a new creature.¹
4. Justification is perfect in an instant, but sanctification is perfected gradually.

§II. Sanctification is, then, being spiritually raised to life from the dead, by which a principle of new life and new actions are infused into him (Eph. 2:5).

§III. The immediate (*proximus*) effect of sanctification is:

1. The removal of the dominion of sin,
2. Liberty,
3. A new creature (2 Cor. 5:17),
4. And good works.

§IV. Good works are actions of the regenerate done:

1. By the power of the Holy Spirit,
2. From faith,
3. Performed according to the law,
4. And for the glory of God (Gal. 5:22).

§V. In the catechism three conditions are required for good works.²

1. They must be done according to the law of God (Gal. 6:16).
2. They must be done from true faith (Rom. 14:23).
3. They must be done for the glory of God (1 Cor. 10:31).

¹ See Chap. 14, §XI, p. 161.

² *The Heidelberg Catechism*, Q. & A. 91.

All of which can only occur by the power of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3).

§VI. No work can truly be a good work or please God without these conditions (Heb. 11:6).

§VII. Good works are necessary for blessedness (*beatitudine*):

1. By a necessity of *precept* (1 Thess. 4:3).
2. As *means* or as a way to the kingdom (Heb. 12:4).³
3. As a *signs* of true faith (James 2:17).
4. By *consequence*, since where the Spirit is, there is liberty (Rom. 8:2).
5. *For the edification of our neighbor* (Mt. 5:16).

§VIII. Works ought to be governed according to the law of God.⁴ For the Israelite people, there was the *moral law*, the *ceremonial law*, and the *political law*.

§IX. The *moral law* sets forth every category of virtue binding on all men; the *ceremonial law* set forth types of the Messiah; and the *political law* gave direction for the people of God at that time.

§X. The commandments of God obligate men in the following ways:

1. In general, all men.
2. Those that refer to a particular state or condition, such as a magistrate, husband, or a father, obligate those who are in that state.
3. The affirmative commandments, such as prayer, giving alms, etc., always obligate all but not at all times.
4. The negative bind everyone at all times. For example, we should never kill [unjustly].⁵

Controversy 1 – *Does the moral law still bind everyone today, and should it be prescribed to everyone?* We affirm against the Antinomians.

³ “Therefore, good works are not necessary to salvation either as merit; or as an efficient cause, whether principal or instrumental, properly so-called; or as in themselves leading to salvation. Rather, as others have said, they have a necessity of presence not of efficiency; or, as Bernard said well, “They are the way to the kingdom not the cause of reigning,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 161.

⁴ “The norm to which good works must be directed is the moral law of God summarized in the Decalogue,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 163.

⁵ I have added unjustly because otherwise one might get the impression that Rijssen believed in pacificism, which he certainly did not. See below, pp. 188-191.

Arguments

1. It must remain (Mt. 5:17, Rom. 3:31).
2. It must be constantly impressed upon people not abrogated (Tit. 3:8, Mt. 5:19).
3. It must be kept (Rom. 13:8-9, Jas. 2:8, Eph. 6:1).

Objections

1. *“The Law and Prophets were until John”* (Mt. 11:13). Reply. They prophesied of the Messiah that was to come.
2. *“We are not under the law”* (Rom. 6:14). Reply. This means: not under the curse of law nor under the covenant of works.
3. *“The law has not been given for the righteous”* (1 Tim. 1:9). Reply. This means that it has not been given to condemn them, but it is given to convict the wicked that they might flee to Christ.

Controversy 2 – *Do any good intentions whatsoever make someone’s work good and acquit them of sin?* We deny against the Papists.⁶

Arguments

1. Some things are carried out with a good intention that are expressly condemned as evil in the Word of God (Jn. 16:2, Acts 26:9).
2. A good intention can come from a good feeling that is without the judgment and knowledge of the Word of God (Rom. 10:2, 14:5, 1 Tim. 1:7-8).
3. Man is under God’s law; therefore, by his intention he cannot make sin not be sin.

Objection

1. *“Grace has been given to me because I did this in ignorance”* (1 Tim. 1:13). Reply. That which is remitted by grace is certainly sin.

Controversy 3 – *Can any man merit grace or glory by his good works?* We deny against the Papists.

⁶ “The Papists want good works to be those which they perform without God commanding or asking them, which Paul calls will worship and condemns (Col. 2:23),” Turretin, *Compendium*, 161.

Arguments

1. All things are given by grace and mercy (Ps. 103:4, Rom. 6:23).
2. Neither grace nor glory is from works (Rom. 11:6, Tit. 3:5).
3. We are not under the covenant of works, and our merit only had a place in that covenant (Rom. 6:14; Gal. 3:11, 13).⁷
4. Heaven is our inheritance that cannot be acquired by merit (Rom. 8:17; Gal. 4:1, 7).
5. If it were by works, then man would have something in which to glory contrary to Rom. 3:27, 4:2-3; 1 Cor. 4:7.
6. In the new covenant, when we have done all that we can, we say, "We are useless servants," we have merited nothing (Lk. 17:10).
7. Christ has merited all things for us *perfectly*; therefore, we can merit nothing (Heb. 10:14).

Objections

1. *God gives to everyone according to his works (Rom. 2:6).* Reply. According to works not on account of them.
2. *Eternal life is a reward.* Reply. Because it is given by grace after labor.
3. *They are said to be worthy (Rev. 3:4, 2 Thess. 1:5).* Reply. This means that they have the requisite qualities, and that God considers them worthy by His grace.
4. *God gives glory as a just judge and by justice (2 Thess. 1:6, 1 Tim. 4:8).* Reply. Justice means faithfulness to His promises (cf. 2 Pet. 1:1).
5. *Heaven is given to men because they are holy (Mt. 25:34).* Reply. Because they have the means, it is necessary for them also to have the end, but this is on account of their connection not merit.

Controversy 4 – *Can unregenerate man, before being justified, merit grace congruently (ex congruo) by any of his works?* We deny against the Papists.⁸

Arguments

1. Every unregenerate person is an enemy of God and an atheist (Rom 5:10; Eph. 2:3, 12; Tit. 3:3); therefore, they can merit nothing.

⁷ See Chap. 9, §VIII, p. 83.

⁸ "They call merit congruent when it is a morally good work, done from free will, not aided by grace," Turretin, *Compendium*, 163.

2. All of their works are sin and displease God (Matt. 12:33-34; Rom. 8:8; 14:23).
3. No one gave anything to God first (Rom. 11:35, 1 Cor. 4:7).
4. All things are given by grace (Rom. 9:16; Jas. 1:18).

Objections

1. *To him who has, more will be given (Mt. 13:12).* Reply. Not by merit but by grace. To him who has the grace of regeneration, the highest grace will be given.
2. *God is pleased by such sacrifices (Heb. 13:16).* Reply. It says that it “delights” or pleases God.
3. *Those who convert are promised grace (Ez. 18:21).* Reply. Forgiveness of sins is promised by grace not merit.

§XI. The first commandment sets forth who should be worshipped and the spiritual virtues with which God should be worshipped, such as *knowledge, faith, hope, love, fear, humility, zeal, etc.*

§XII. It forbids sins like *idolatry, sorcery, divination, superstition, invocation of saints, etc.*

Controversy 1 on the 1st Commandment: *Is it permitted to religiously worship or invoke angels, dead saints, or any creature?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Only God is to be worshipped (Mt. 4:10).
2. Those who by nature are not God should not be worshipped (Gal. 4:8).
3. Those in whom we do not believe should not be worshipped (Rom. 10:14), but we did not believe in the saints (Jn. 14:1).
4. Those who are not “our Father” should not be worshipped (Mt. 6:9).
5. The saints and angels do not want to be invoked or worshipped (Acts 10:25, Rev. 19:10).
6. They do not know the thoughts and state of our heart and consequently whether we are praying rightly.

Objections

1. *In the Old Testament, they worshipped angels (Gen. 18:2).* Reply. No, only Christ. They only showed angels civil honor (*honorem politicum*).

2. *“He worshipped the footstool of his feet” (Ps. 99:5).* Reply. It reads, “before the footstool” or tabernacle of God.
3. *“He worshipped the top of his staff” (Heb. 11:21).* Reply. No, leaning on the staff.
4. *They carry our prayers to God (Rev. 5:8).* Reply. Not ours but theirs.
5. *The saints pray for us (Lk. 16:27).* Reply. It is a parable. He was not a saint, and he was not worshipping God.
6. *“To which of the holy ones will you turn” (Job 5:1)?* Reply. This is said to happen foolishly; or, Eliphaz means that what happened to Job has never happened to any holy person; therefore, Job is not a holy person.⁹

Controversy 2 on the 1st Commandment – *Can the Pope put certain people on the catalogue of saints and prescribe that they be publicly worshipped and prayed to?* We deny against the same.¹⁰

Arguments

1. The saints should not be religiously worshipped; therefore, they should not be canonized.
2. The Pope is ignorant of the condition of individual dead men; therefore, he cannot canonize them.
3. He who can canonize can also remove from the canon, and both are absurd.
4. We never read of it in the Old or New Testament.

Objections

1. *It belongs to the Pope to say who are heretics and therefore also those who are saints.* Reply. Both are fallacious.
2. *Otherwise we could not imitate them.* Reply. Those whom we know we can.

Controversy 3 on the 1st Commandment – *Can and should Christ be worshipped and invoked as Mediator?* We affirm against the followers of

⁹ “When Eliphaz urges Job to turn to one of the holy ones, he is not speaking of dead saints but of a favorable, living advocate. Eliphaz denies that any can be brought forward who will agree with Job and affirm that God afflicts the innocent and righteous,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 169.

¹⁰ “Among the Papists, one foundation of the invocation of saints is canonization or apotheosis of the saints by which the Roman Pope declares with certain ceremonies what saints are to be invoked,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 169.

Francis David.¹¹ *Is this absolutely necessary?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. There is an express commandment to worship Him (Rom. 14:11, Phil. 2:10, Heb. 1:6).
2. There are innumerable examples of it (Jn. 9:38, 20:28; Acts 7:59; 1 Thess. 3:11, etc.).
3. The faithful are described as those who invoke Christ (1 Cor. 1:2, 2 Tim. 2:19).
4. He has all things necessary for worship, for He is God (1 Jn. 5:20), knows the heart, and gives salvation (Rev. 2:23, 26).

Objections

1. *The formula of the Lord's prayer is only to the Father.* Reply. *Father* is predicated essentially (*housiadōs*¹²). The name "Father" refers to the Triune God.
2. *You will worship the Lord your God (Mt. 4:10).* Christ is also the Lord your God.
3. *The true worshippers worship the Father in spirit.* Reply. The name *Father* is also taken essentially in this verse.

Controversy 4 on the 1st Commandment – *Should Christ as Mediator be worshipped? In other words, is the mediatorial office of Christ the foundation of the worship of Christ?* We deny against the Socinians and Arminians.¹³

¹¹ Francis David (1510?-1576) was a Unitarian in Transylvania who denied, unlike the Socinians, that Christ should be worshipped. In 1578, the famous Unitarian, Dr. Biandrata, called Faustus Socinus to come to Transylvania to help him combat the views of Francis David. See Stansilas Lubieniecki, *History of the Polish Reformation and Nine Related Documents*, translated and interpreted by George Hunston Williams (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

¹² The names of God can be either essential, referring to the one God in three persons, or they can be personal, referring to one of the three persons. Rijssen contends that the name "Father" can be used essentially or personally.

¹³ "We deny against the Socinians, Papists, etc. Not only the Papists give occasion for this question who ask whether the human nature of Christ should be worshipped but also the Lutheran ubiquitousists who dispute concerning the worship of Christ according to the human nature, but it is above all with the Socinians. For when the Orthodox press on them the eternal Deity of Christ from the worship that is owed to Him, they seek to elude this argument by distinguishing between the worship and adoration that is attribute to God the Father as the first cause and that which is attributed to Christ the Mediator as such," Turretin, *Compendium*, 169.

Arguments

1. Only God is to be worshipped (Mt. 4:10); therefore, His deity is the only foundation of worship.
2. Christ in relation to the mediatorial office is a servant and less than God (Is. 49:3, 5-6); therefore, it cannot be the foundation of the worship.
3. That which does not have deity as its basis cannot be the foundation of worship, for only deity is to be worshipped (Is. 42:8).
4. If it were the foundation of worship, then those natures should be worshipped according to which He is Mediator and then also the human nature contrary to Gal. 4:8.
5. Mediation is a temporary duty, but the foundation of worship ought to be eternal.
6. Then there would be two worships, one as God in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit and the other as Mediator.

Objections

1. *“You are worthy of honor because You were slain” (Rev. 5:9).* Reply. It refers to the person who is worthy of that honor and praise because He redeemed us.
2. *Souls and consciences should be subject to Christ as Mediator.* Reply. Also to a prophet insofar as he expounds the Word of God and even to a king who has been constituted such by God (Rom. 13:1).
3. *We should believe in Christ who is the Mediator.* Reply. This means that we should receive Him by faith as Mediator, but the foundation of that reception is that God offers Him to us.

Controversy 5 on the 1st Commandment – *Is it ever permitted for anyone to doubt concerning God’s existence, the word of God, Christ, or similar things?* We deny against the Cartesians.¹⁴

Arguments

1. Full certainty is commanded to all at all times (Rom. 14:5); therefore, doubt is forbidden.
2. Everyone who doubts wavers, but this is prohibited (Jas. 1:6, Eph. 4:14, 1 K. 18:21).

¹⁴ The Reformed in Holland and elsewhere were divided over the question of Descartes’ (1596-1650) philosophy. Generally, the followers of Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676), such as Rijssen, opposed it, while the followers of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669) had a more favorable view of it.

3. All who are of little faith or defective in faith are rebuked (Mt. 14:31); therefore, doubt is also rebuked and much more unbelief, which is a cause of damnation (Jn. 8:24).
4. If it were permitted to doubt about God, then it would also be permitted to neglect His worship; but this is never permitted.
5. Everyone, insofar as they doubt, wanders (*errat*) from the truth, but every error (*error*) is rebuked (Gal. 6:7).

Objections

1. *It is the way to certain knowledge.* Reply. On the contrary, rather to Atheism. The way to knowledge (*scientiam*) is investigation not doubt.
2. *Doubt is for a short time.* Reply. Blasphemy can also be for a short time, but it does not cease to be sin.

§XIII. In the second commandment God commands in what way and with what external public and private worship He desires to be worshipped.

Controversy 1 on the 2nd Commandment – *Is it permitted to make images of God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit?* We deny against the Papists and Lutherans.¹⁵

Arguments

1. God expressly prohibited them (Ex. 20:4; Dt. 4:15-16).
2. The Gentiles have been severely punished on account of them (Rom. 1:23-24).
3. God is an infinite being, whose image cannot be formed (Is. 40:18, 46:5).
4. Every image is formed according to an exact similitude, but this neither can nor should be done concerning God.

Objections

1. *God appeared in visible forms, so what prohibits Him from being painted in that way?* Reply. God's command prohibits it. God gave them as proofs (*specimina*) of His presence not as a picture (*specimina*) of Himself.

¹⁵ "The Lutherans indeed oppose the worship of images, but they try to defend the making and use of them in sacred places as legitimate for reminders," Turretin, *Compendium*, 173.

2. *Scripture attributes human body parts to God in words; therefore, He can be pictured.* Reply. No. It never attributes human body parts to him but only explains His perfections by a comparison that He does not want to be pictured.
3. *The angels are pictured.* Reply. They are not infinite.

Controversy 2 on the 2nd Commandment – *Is it permitted to use images in any religious worship?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. It has been expressly prohibited to worship (*colere vel adorare*) images (Ex. 20:4, 1 Cor. 10:20).
2. The worship of images is described as the vilest idolatry (Rev. 9:20).
3. Images cannot have an awareness (*sensum*) of our worship; therefore, they should not be worshipped (*coli*) (Ps. 115:4ff.).
4. Hezekiah broke the copper serpent when it began to be worshipped (2 Kings 18:4).
5. Man is the image of God, but he should not be worshipped.

Objections

1. *Images of cherubim were worshipped (1 Kings 7:29).* Reply. No more than the lions or palms mentioned in the same text.
2. *Images perform miracles.* Reply. They cannot because they have no understanding (*non intelligunt*).
3. *An image is capable of injury.* Reply. No more than it is capable of jealousy, hatred, or treachery.
4. *An image of the king is venerated and so also those of the saints.* Reply. He should not be worshipped (*coli*) religiously or with a civil worship (*civili cultu*).¹⁶

Controversy 3 on the 2nd Commandment – *Is it permitted or useful for images to be set up in churches (templis) for teaching?* We deny against the same.

¹⁶ Rijssen lists as objection 3 in the first controversy on the 2nd commandment in Turretin, *Compendium*, “*The honor given to the image is transferred to the prototype and the original.* Reply. If he who is the original would himself institute it as such; but if on the contrary, he forbids that they be made of him or that they be honored, then they do him wrong,” 172.

Arguments

1. God wanted His people to be taught by the preaching of the Word not by images (Mt. 28:19, Lk. 16:29).
2. Images by themselves can teach nothing. Someone must explain what the painter may have meant.
3. Images teach lies, since they say that God is like them (Jer. 10:8, Hab. 2:18, Zech. 10:2).
4. Faith is by hearing (Rom. 10:17) and godliness through the Word of God (Tit. 2:11-12) not by images.

Objections

1. *God teaches by signs.* Reply. A sign of presence is one thing; an image made to express likeness is another.
2. *Images motivate piety.* Reply. They cannot. The mind is only moved by it remembering the divine history.

Controversy 4 on the 2nd Commandment – *Should the wood or sign of the cross be worshipped (coli vel adorari)?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. If it were to be honored, the Apostles would have preserved it, which they did not.
2. No one can know if any wood is the wood of the cross; therefore, idolatry is committed.
3. The cross on which Christ suffered should not be honored any more than the men by whom He suffered.

Objections

1. *The cross is sanctified by contact with the body of Christ.* Reply. No more than the lip of Judas or the hand of the soldiers who hit Him with their fists.
2. *The cross has amazingly been found.*¹⁷ Reply. That is an amazing fabrication.
3. *“The sign of the Son of Man will appear” (Mt. 24:30).* Reply. This means the Son of Man Himself will appear.
4. *The sign on the forehead (Ez. 9:4, Rev. 7:3) is the sign of the cross.* Reply. That is pure fiction. *Thau (ⲥ)* does not refer to the cross.¹⁸

¹⁷ St. Helena (250?-330?), the Mother of Constantine I, is credited with finding the holy cross in Jerusalem.

Controversy 5 on the 2nd Commandment – *Is the vow of poverty and blind obedience holy or permitted?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. All will worship (*cultus voluntarius*), invented by man, is not permitted (Mt. 15:9, Col. 2:23).
2. They cannot be from faith; therefore, they are sins (Rom. 14:23).
3. The saints pray that God would keep them from poverty (Prov. 31:8).
4. No one should subject himself absolutely to any man (1 Cor. 7:23, Acts 5:29).

Objections

1. *The Saints in the Old Testament vowed vows.* Reply. Concerning things permitted not concerning things that were contrary to the Word of God.
2. *A vow should be kept in all cases whatsoever.* Reply. Not if you swear that you will do something evil.
3. *“Go and sell all” (Mt. 19).* Reply. This command was to a specific person like “walk on the water” (Mt. 14:19).
4. *The Rechabites are praised who kept the vow of their father (Jer. 35).* Reply. They are not praised as if they honored God by it, but the Jews are rebuked because they were less constant in religion than the Rechabites were in the civil realm (*politicè*).

§XIV. In the third commandment, God prescribes the manner (*modo*) in which He wants to be worshipped, namely, with attention, devotion, holiness, and all our strength.

§XV. Consequently, a fearful, false, idolatrous, and superstitious oath is prohibited.

§XVI. To this commandment also belongs the use of lots, which is a petition of divine decision in matters purely dependent on chance.

§XVII. Lots are distinguished because they are:

1. Either of divination for knowing hidden things, which is forbidden;
2. Or of division, in dividing goods;

¹⁸ The Vulgate translates the Hebrew, “et signa thau frontes...” Rijssenius points out that this refers to the Hebrew letter *thau*, which does not look like a cross. The mistake was made because the Hebrew letter sounds like the Roman letter *t*, which does look like the cross.

3. Or judicial, for setting a sentence.

§XVIII. Therefore, lots must only be used when it is a matter that is either *adiaphora*¹⁹ or concerning goods.

Controversy 1 on the 3rd Commandment – *Is a Christian man permitted to swear an oath or to call on God as a witness in urgent necessities?* We affirm against the Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. It is praised in the Old Testament as something good and holy (Ex. 22:10, Dt. 6:13, Jer. 4:2).
2. The Old Testament predicts that holy oaths will be taken by the people of the New Testament²⁰ (Is. 45:23, 65:16).
3. There are examples of oaths in the New Testament (Rom. 1:9, 2 Cor. 1:23, Gal. 1:20, Rev. 10:6).
4. An oath is also set forth in the New Testament as an end of dispute (Heb. 4:6).
5. Swearing or obligation under oath is permitted (1 Thess. 5:27).

Objections

1. “*Do not swear at all*” (Mt. 5:35, Jas. 5:12). Reply. Not by heaven or earth or any creature.
2. “*Let your ‘yes’ be ‘yes’ and your ‘no,’ ‘no’*” (Mt. 5:37). Reply. In common speech.
3. *We should be men of such truthfulness that it would not be necessary to swear an oath.* Reply. When this is the case, an oath will also be omitted.

Controversy 2 on the 3rd Commandment – *Is the art of exorcism, by which blessed water (as they call it), the sign of the cross, or the invocation of saints are used to command devils who are said to be expelled from those who are possessed, permitted?* We deny against the Papists.

¹⁹ According to Marck, *adiaphora* means “not determined by the law,” *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, XI.36.

²⁰ Rijssen in *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* (Edinburgh: George Morman, 1692), 256, has “Old Testament,” but in Turretin, *Compendium*, 174, has “New Testament.” The latter seems to make more sense of the verses cited.

Arguments

1. These things have not been instituted by God and therefore can have no divine power.
2. A spirit is not expelled by material things but only by the power of God (Mt. 17:21, 12:29).
3. It is merely the magic of herbs and words (*in herbis et verbis*) concocted for supernatural power.
4. This was not an art used by the Apostles, but they had the faith of miracles, which these exorcists do not.

Objections

1. "*He gave them power over unclean spirits*" (Mt. 10:1). Reply. "And over all sickness" is added; therefore, if they cannot do one miracle, they cannot do the other. The same reply is given to Mk. 16:17-18.
2. *There were such in the Old Testament.* Reply. We deny the antecedent and consequent.
3. *Experience proves this art to be good.* Reply. On the contrary, it proves it to be a mere fraud and collusion with the devil.

Controversy 3 on the 3rd Commandment – *Are lots permitted for play, and are they permitted for a game, a joke, or for making money?* We deny against the papists.

Arguments

1. Because the lot has been instituted so that it might be a consultation of divine providence and a request for its decision (Prov. 16:33).
2. The lot has been established for the determination of a controversy that cannot be otherwise decided (Prov. 18:18), but this has no place in a game.
3. Those casting lots commit their cause to be decided by the Highest Judge for decision, which is not permitted in a game.
4. And consequently men subject themselves to a lot as to the divine voice (Acts 1:24).
5. Lots in a game are the origin of cursing and brawls.

Objections

1. *A lot is lawfully used in things of small moment.* Reply. Even though these things are light as to the matter, they are often serious in their consequence.

2. *A lot is something that is adiaphora; therefore, it is appropriate for a game.* Reply. It ought to be something holy.
3. *A lot repeated very often has various outcomes.* Reply. It should not be repeated, and God can give another outcome as punishment for repeating it.

§XIX. In the 4th commandment, God sets forth what day He requires for His public worship, the seventh day.

§XX. This commandment can certainly be said to be *positive* in relation to God, for He was able to institute another day; but in relation to man it is *natural* and *moral*, and he understands that it is equitable because of the image of God.²¹

§XXI. This commandment has something in common with the rest of the commandments, namely, that we should *keep ourselves from sin*. It also has something unique. It determines *the time of public worship* and commands us to keep ourselves from work.

§XXII. The determination of the day can be said to be a part of the *external worship*. Freedom remained for God, and He was able to change the day *while still maintaining the law in its vigor*, e.g. what sacraments and ceremonies were to be performed on it.

§XXIII. In the Jewish Sabbath, there were most certainly many things that were ceremonial, since an entire ceremonial worship had to be performed *especially* on that day, but the Sabbath itself is not for that reason a ceremony because six days should certainly be given to work and the seventh to public worship.

§XXIV. This commandment commands two things, *cessation from labor* and *attending divine worship*; therefore, rest is also a part of worship insofar as rest has been commanded on account of God. The actions to be performed are: hearing the preaching of the divine Word, reading the Word, singing, prayer, meditation, acts of mercy, and the use of the sacraments.

²¹ “Although it does not depend absolutely in the first place on the natural right of God but depends on His will and thus depends rather on His positive right, it does not follow that it cannot be moral and perpetual in relation to a secondary right and natural to us. For what is positive to God can be natural to us,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 179. “Positive law is that which is derived only from the most wise will of God and endures only for a time. Natural law is that which is derived either from the nature of God or man and is binding equally on all people at all times,” Johannes à Marck, *Christianae Theologiae Medulla*, XI:13.

Controversy 1 on the 4th Commandment – *Was the Sabbath instituted from the very creation of the world and not in the wilderness?* We affirm.

Arguments

1. “Now when God had ceased from all his work, He Himself rested on that day,” and N.B. “since He had rested on that day,” He made that day holy for men or “sanctified it” (Gen. 2:2-3).
2. The Apostle in Heb. 4:3-4 shows that the rest of the people of God (Ps. 95) was not the rest of the Sabbath, since the rest of the Sabbath was already instituted from the beginning, but this rest was promised after.
3. The reason for observing it is given in the Decalogue itself, namely, because God sanctified it or wanted to make it holy after He completed His work.
4. There is a mention of the Sabbath as something known and celebrated before the law was received “Tomorrow is the Sabbath of Jehovah” (Ex. 16:23).
5. Where else could the common custom of the nations of dividing the year into weeks come from?

Objections

1. *God did nothing in that day which would make it a day of celebration and holiness.* Reply. He rested and wanted man to rest and be free to attend His worship.
2. *Adam did not have servants, female servants, strangers, etc.; therefore, this commandment meant nothing to him.* Reply. Then neither did the 5th, 7th, or 8th. The commandment was extended as the number of men increased.
3. *God gave the Jews the Sabbath.* Reply. As He did the whole law. He renewed the commandments given to Adam.
4. *God entered into a covenant with the Jews that He had not with the fathers (Dt. 5:2).* Reply. Not concerning the observation of the Sabbath but because they were His people in a civil state.
5. *Only the Jews are rebuked on account of the neglect of the Sabbath.* Reply. What then? We do not read that the Patriarchs were rebuked on account of polygamy. And he who is accused of the neglect of the worship of God, as the Gentiles were, is accused also of the neglect of the Sabbath (Rom. 1:25).

Controversy 2 on Commandment 4 – *Is the content of the 4th commandment, namely, “after six days of work, the seventh is to be given to divine worship,” completely ceremonial and abrogated in Christ?* We deny against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. The 4th commandment is one of the laws from which no commandment should be removed as not pertaining to us (Mt. 5:18-19).
2. The other part of the commandment is moral, "Six days will be to you for work"; therefore, the other part is also.
3. The Sabbath was instituted before the fall; therefore, it is not a Jewish ceremony.
4. The reason for the commandment is not ceremonial, nor does it pertain only to the Jews but rather to everyone: "because God rested the seventh day."
5. The thing commanded is not ceremonial but moral, that God should be publicly and solemnly worshipped.
6. The same is a necessity for all men, namely, worshipping God at a certain time.
7. Christ speaks of the Sabbath (Mt. 24:20) in such a way that it will be perpetual. "In winter it is difficult to flee on the Sabbath and harmful to your soul."

Objections

1. *The Sabbath is a sign.* Reply. What then? A natural and a moral thing can be a sign like the rainbow and marriage.
2. *Nature does not teach the Sabbath.* Reply. Nor the Trinity, the Mediator, regeneration, or justification, but knowledge of them is moral and necessary.
3. *"Let no one judge you in (N.B.) food, drink, or the Sabbaths, which are shadows" (Col. 2:16).* Reply. From this it no more follows that the Sabbath is not holy than the food in the Lord's Supper is not holy. 2. It refers to the Sabbaths of the Jews, observed in the Jewish manner.
4. *The Sabbath is joined with sacrifice (Mt. 12).* Reply. Only in that the observation of the Sabbath can be omitted by such an urgent necessity as sacrifice.

Controversy 3 on the 4th Commandment – *Do Christians observe the Lord's Day only according to the tradition of the Church or rather by an Apostolic and Divine institution?* We deny the former and affirm the latter against the Socinians and Papists.

Arguments

1. It is expressly called "the Lord's Day" (Rev. 1:10) like "the Lord's Supper" (1 Cor. 11:20).

2. Christ and the Apostles observed that day and bequeathed it to us by their example (Jn. 20:19, 26; Acts 2:1-2, 8; 20:7, 10-11).
3. They ordained that day for holy exercises (1 Cor. 16:1-2).
4. No one except by the authority of God was able to abrogate the Sabbath of the Jews and institute the first day (Gal. 4:10).
5. If the Church instituted it, then the Church can abrogate it; but this cannot be.

Objections

1. *We have no commandment to observe it.* Reply. It remains a command of the 4th commandment.
2. *“Others judge every day to be equal” (Rom. 14:5).* It is not approved, but it says, “Each one should be completely certain of divine institution in his conscience.”²²

Controversy 4 on the 4th Commandment – *May the Church have besides the Lord’s Day other festival days and holy days properly so-called?*²³ We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Neither Christ nor the Apostles instituted such festivals.
2. Nor did they observe such feasts as an example to us.
3. The Word of God rejects the observation of any other festival besides the Lord’s Day (Gal. 4:10, Col. 2:16).
4. The Church does not have authority to make holy days (1 Cor. 4:1-2, 6:12).
5. It would be will worship (*cultus voluntarius*), which is rebuked (Col. 2:23).
6. God established six days of work for all men; therefore, it is not in the power of men to make festivals and holy days out of those days.

²² “This is to be understood of the distinction of the ceremonial days that obtained among the Jews under the O.T. where they constituted a part of divine worship and where they were to be painstakingly and rigidly observed or such that obtained among the Gentiles who distinguished some days as in themselves luckier and holier than other days. Otherwise, if all observation of days was absolutely and simply condemned, it would not be permissible to observe any day for solemnly worshipping God, neither could Paul prescribe as He did that they gather every seventh day and make collections (1 Cor. 16:2),” Turretin, *Compendium*, 179.

²³ “Festivals, properly so-called, which are by a necessity of faith obligatory in themselves and in relation to a mystery must be commanded by the Word of God,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 180.

Objections

1. *Judas Maccabeas instituted the Feast of Dedication (1 Mac. 4:59).* Reply. It was a political festival not a sacred one.
2. *“The Festival of the Dedication of the Temple” (Jn. 10:22).* Reply. This was a festival for the same reason as above, and it is not approved or rebuked in that verse.
3. *We have Easter, Pentecost, etc.* Reply. Not as sacred days but as ecclesiastical customs.²⁴

§XXV. In the fifth commandment, God prescribes the duty of inferiors toward superiors and superiors toward inferiors such as that between parents and children, masters and servants, and magistrates and subjects.

Controversy 1 on the 5th Commandment – *Is it permitted for a Christian man to serve in the government or rule a republic?* We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. They are Ministers of God established by Him, and He commands us to obey them (Rom. 13:1ff.; 1 Pet. 2:13-14).
2. We are to pray for them in their condition and government that they might rule justly; therefore, they do not sin because they rule (1 Tim. 2:1-2).
3. It was predicted in the Old Testament that there would be Christian kings (Ps. 72:11, Is. 49:23, Rev. 21:24).
4. Christ Himself approved the power of kings, “Kings rule over others” (Lk. 22:25). This is permitted, “but in the Church do not rule that way.”
5. When those established in such an office were converted to the Christian religion, they retained that office, as the proconsul (Acts 13:7, 12), the centurion (10:47), the ruler (8:27, 37), and a senator (Mk. 15:43) did.
6. There is the same necessity for having magistrates in the New Testament as there was in the Old Testament, namely, for public peace.

²⁴ “Our days differ greatly from the Papists. 1. Because these days are dedicated solely to God not to creatures. 2. No holiness, power, or efficacy is believed to reside in them in themselves as if they were holier than other days. 3. We do not bind believers to an exceedingly strict and scrupulous abstinence from all servile work on them... 4. The Church is not bound to any inflexible necessity of observing those days,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 180.

Objections

1. *“Kings have dominion (imperant), but you will not do so” (Mt. 20:25).* Reply. In the Church in ecclesiastical offices.
2. *Christ did not want to be a king or a judge.* Reply. Since He was not called or chosen to that office.
3. *The kingdom of Christ is not of this world (Jn. 18:36).* Reply. Therefore, He seized no political power or money in the world and did not have property.
4. *Modesty and humility are commanded for Christians.* Reply. These virtues can also exist in men in the highest offices.

Controversy 2 on the 5th Commandment – *Is the magistrate permitted to shed the blood of wicked men?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. Whoever sheds man’s blood, by man his blood will be shed (Gen. 9:6); therefore, there should be someone who carries this out.
2. It was expressly enjoined on the magistrate in the Old Testament (Ex. 21:12).
3. Since it is said that he bears the sword for the punishment of evildoers (Rom. 13:4).
4. The law of Christ is also that he who lives by the sword will die by the sword (Mt. 26:42).

Objections

1. *Revenge is prohibited (Mt. 5:38-39).* Reply. Private revenge, but the magistrate punishes in the name of God.
2. *We should love our enemies (Mt. 5:44).* Reply. But God more, and He wanted them to be punished.
3. *“Do not kill.”* Reply. The innocent, and not by private authority, but the criminal may be killed.
4. *“Vengeance is mine” (Rom. 12:19).* Reply. God also avenges when He punishes through the magistrate.
5. *We should forgive our neighbor.* Reply. We should forgive injuries done to us but not a crime insofar as God wants it to be punished.

Controversy 3 on the 5th Commandment – *Are Christian magistrates permitted to wage war both in itself and for defending their country against enemies by force and arms?* We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. John the Baptist did not prohibit soldiers to go to war (Lk. 3:14); therefore, it is permitted.
2. In the Old Testament, wars were permitted and commanded by God (Jos. 1:6, Jud. 3:9) and therefore also today, for the same reason exists in both cases. There are dangers.
3. Soldiers were never rejected from the communion of Christ or the Church simply because they were soldiers (Mt. 8:18, Acts 10:1).
4. He who bears a sword for the punishment of the wicked is required on account of his office to defend his country with the sword (Rom. 13:4).
5. God commands Christian people to devastate Anti-Christ with war and arms (Rev. 18:6, 8; 17:16).²⁵

Objections

1. *“The weapons of our warfare are not carnal”* (2 Cor. 10:4). Reply. “Our” means of the Church.
2. *They do not wage war* (Is. 2:4). Reply. This means they will have peace in Christ, but the ungodly do not have this.²⁶
3. *God did not want David to build a house because he was a soldier* (1 Chron. 28:3). Reply. It is mystical, since it was to be a house of peace not of war.

§XXXVI. In the 6th commandment, God commands that man preserve both his own and his neighbor’s health and life, and that he not reduce or injure it in his heart, with his words, or by his deeds.

Controversy on the 6th Commandment – *Is a Christian man permitted to defend his life by force and arms against robbers and invaders?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments.

1. Each one should protect and defend his home (Ex. 22:2, 1 Tim. 5:8) and, therefore, also himself.

²⁵ See Matthew Poole, *Synopsis Criticorum*, 5:col. 1863, 1858-9.

²⁶ “This is not to be understood externally but spiritually, of the peace of the kingdom of Christ, and the meaning is: the propagation of the kingdom of Christ is not with carnal arms but only occurs by the preaching of the Gospel and the power of the Holy Spirit, but this takes nothing away from the magistrate’s right to wage war,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 183.

2. It is the natural right given to everyone who has life to defend their life with arms.
3. God also commanded Christians not to hate their life but to feed and defend it (Eph. 5:29).
4. He who allows himself to be killed by another when it can be stopped murders himself.
5. Otherwise, a Christian would love his neighbor, even one who is a robber, more than himself contrary to Mt. 22:39.

Objections

1. *Do not resist an evil person (Mt. 5:38-39).* Reply. From wrath and with an intention to avenge. 2. When there is a magistrate who can defend us.
2. *Then you do not love your neighbor.* Reply. I do not owe him love as a robber, as a man I wish him a better frame of mind.²⁷

§XXVII. The 7th commandment commands chastity, sobriety, modesty, and vigilance.

§XXVIII. It prohibits all impure thoughts, words, clothes, gestures, pictures, and actions.

Controversy on the 7th Commandment – *Is perpetual celibacy and prohibition of marriage rightly enjoined on ecclesiastical persons?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Everyone is allowed to enter into marriage; therefore, ecclesiastical persons are as well (1 Cor. 7:28, Heb. 13:4).
2. It is expressly described as a condition that supremely agrees with it: “If he is a man of one wife” (1 Tim. 3:2, Tit. 1:6).
3. The Apostles themselves had wives (Mt. 8:14; 1 Cor. 9:5-6).
4. It is demonic to prohibit marriage (1 Tim. 4:1, 3).

Objections

1. *They should be holy and chaste.* Reply. These virtues exist more in marriage than they do in monks in monasteries.

²⁷ “The love of enemy does not take away the necessary defense of our life because the foundation of the love of our neighbor is the love of ourselves,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 183.

2. *They should not be entangled (implicari) in secular business.* Reply. What this command requires is required of every Christian.
3. *They should abstain from one another.* Reply. It is conceded in extraordinary cases *with the consent of both parties*, and it is never commanded.

§XXXIX. In the eighth commandment, God commands all equity, justice, charity, and conservation of our own and our neighbor's goods.

§XXX. It forbids robbery and theft or destroying our own goods or those of our country, Church, or neighbor.

Controversy on the 8th Commandment – *Should all the goods of every Christian be held in common with all others?* We deny against certain Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. Each one should have and care for his own house (1 Tim. 5:8) and eat his own bread (2 Thes. 3:12).
2. There are rich and poor amongst Christians (1 Tim. 6:17, Jas. 1:10); therefore, there is individual ownership.
3. Contracts of buying and selling and equity in them is commended (1 Cor. 7:30, 1 Tim. 4:6). Individual ownership follows from this command.
4. Charitable giving is commended in the New Testament (Eph. 4:28, Heb. 13:16).
5. The commandment against stealing would be useless.

Objections

1. *“Go and sell all” (Mt. 19:21).* Reply. It was a personal commandment for convincing him of his imperfections.
2. *“They had all things in common” (Acts 2:44, 4:32).* Reply. As to use and for a brief time, not as to ownership as appears from 5:4 and 12:12.

§XXXI. In the 9th commandment, God commands that we preserve the good name and honor of our neighbor with the appropriate truth, fidelity, silence, and frankness.

§XXXII. But it forbids all lying, simulation, flattery, calumny, evil suspicion, gossip, etc.

Controversy on the 9th Commandment – *Is equivocation or mental reservation in words or oaths or deceiving our neighbor by testifying one thing in words and thinking something else in our mind permitted? We deny against the Jesuits.*

Arguments

1. Each one should put away lying and speak the truth to his neighbor (Eph. 4:25, 2 Cor. 4:2).
2. God detests a lying tongue, a double-speaking mouth, and a double heart (Prov. 12:22, Jer. 9:8).
3. Then the commandment “do not lie” would be a joke, for neither man nor devil could be found guilty of lying.
4. It would necessarily result in throwing into confusion every society and contract among men.
5. Then an oath would not be the end of controversy.

Objections

1. *The examples of the saints, such as Abraham, Jacob, etc. (Gen. 12:2, 27:19).* Reply. These acts are never approved.
2. *God blessed the midwives on account of lies (Ex. 1:19-20).* Reply. It is not clear that they were lying, much less that God blessed them on account of lying.
3. *God Himself used equivocation (Is. 38:1, Jon. 3:4).* Reply. God testifies that He punishes wickedness so that men might repent, and He will not send the punishment against them if they repent.
4. *“I am not going to up to the feast” (Jn. 12:8), but He went.* Reply. It says, “I am not going down,” meaning, “not yet.”
5. *Christ dissimulated (Lk. 24:28).* Reply. Neither in words nor for deceiving his neighbor, nor in something moral, but He made a motion that one is accustomed to make who would go on, and He would have gone on, except that He was detained by the disciples.
6. *Tricks and pretending (artes et simulationes) in war.* Reply. 1. It is in something permitted, such as pretending sleep. 2. It is well-known enough to the enemies that war is going to be waged with force of arms and with art (*arte & marte*).

§XXXIII. In the 10th commandment, God prohibits the slightest coveting (*concupiscentia*)²⁸ whatsoever of something forbidden, even when that coveting precedes the consent of the will.

²⁸ I have translated the Latin word *concupiscentia* as coveting, concupiscence, or as desire according to what seemed best for the context. Keep in mind that the Latin word is the same.

Controversy 1 on the 10th Commandment – *Are coveting (concupisces) our neighbor’s wife and our neighbor’s house two commandments?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. One and the same sin is prohibited, namely, coveting; therefore, it is one commandment.
2. The Apostle speaks of it as only one commandment, “Do not covet” (Rom. 7:7).
3. Because what is placed before (Ex. 20) is also placed after (Dt. 5); therefore, they are not different commandments.

Objections

1. *It is coveting of another kind, one of the wife and the other of the house.* Reply. It is not of another kind but of another object as in honoring of life, chastity, etc.

Controversy 2 on the 10th Commandment – *Is that propensity to evil, which is ordinarily called concupiscence, truly and properly sin?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. It is called “sin” and “inherent sin,” and even more “the body of sin” (Rom. 7:17-18, 24).
2. It is opposed to the spirit (Gal. 5:17) and to the law of the mind (Rom. 7:23).
3. It must be killed (*mortificari*) or subjugated and extinguished (Col. 3:5).
4. It impedes the good and incites men to evil (Rom. 7:19-20, 23).
5. It is not from God but from the evil one (1 Jn. 2:16).
6. The saints hate it and groan because of it (Rom. 7:24).

Objections

1. *“I do not do it but sin in me”;* therefore, it was not his sin (Rom. 7:17-18). Reply. Every sin in man is the sin of man.
2. *Desire (concupiscentia) gives birth to sin; therefore, it is not sin (Jas. 1:15).* Reply. On the contrary, whatever gives birth to sin in man is sin.
3. *There is nothing worthy of condemnation in the justified (Rom. 8:1).* Reply. Then there is no actual sin either. It says, “There is no condemnation” on account of sin.

4. *Sin does not reign (Rom. 6:14).* Reply. It is still sin, even if it does not reign.
5. *Concupiscence (concupiscentia) is natural to man.* Reply. Insofar as and since he is corrupt, it is also sin.

Controversy 3 on the 10th Commandment – *Is the first movement or desire of evil, preceding the consent of the will truly and properly sin?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. It is an act of the human will contrary to the law; therefore it is lawlessness (*anomia*) (1 Jn. 3:4).
2. It is opposed to the good will and purpose of a godly man; therefore, it is sin (Rom. 7:15).
3. It does not arise from a regenerated spirit but from the corruption of man; therefore, it is sin (Mt. 15:19).
4. It is opposed to the perfection required in loving God “with all our heart and strength” (Mt. 22:37).

Objections

1. *They are not in the power of man; therefore, they are not sins.*
Reply. Man by the fall completely lost the power of mastering and subjugating the flesh.

Controversy 4 on the 10th Commandment – *Can a justified and regenerated man fulfill the law perfectly?* We deny against the Papists, Socinians, and Arminians.²⁹

Arguments

1. No one can cleanse and purify himself completely from sin (Prov. 20:9) or be perfect (Phil. 3:12).
2. Man is led captive by his flesh so that, even if he desired, he could not be perfect (Rom. 7:23).
3. The flesh always opposes the spirit (Gal. 5:17, Rom. 8:13).
4. No one can be without sin (1 Jn. 1:8, Jas. 3:2, Eccl. 7:20).
5. The perfection of the moral and ceremonial law is a yoke which no one can bear (Acts 15:10).

²⁹ “The Papists and Socinians (calling Pelagianism back up from hell) that they might open up for themselves a way to the merit of works, have held that the law can be perfectly fulfilled by the regenerate,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 190.

6. All who are under the law are under the curse insofar as and since they cannot fulfill the law (Gal. 3:10).

Objections

1. *The law is easy (Mt. 11:30).* Reply. This does not refer to the law but to the yoke of Christ. It is easy because it is pleasing and agreeable to man.
2. *He who loves his neighbor fulfills the law (Rom. 13:8).* Reply. That also cannot be done perfectly.
3. *The saints are said to have fulfilled the law (Jos. 11:15, Lk. 1:6, Acts 13:12).* Reply. By sincerity of soul, effort, and perfection of parts not degree.
4. *He who is born of God does not sin (1 Jn. 3:6).* Reply. Unto death.

Controversy 5 on the 10th Commandment – *Are all works of the regenerate imperfect and sinful?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. All our righteousness is like filthy rags (Is. 64:6).
2. The virtues of faith and love are imperfect and thus also the works arising from them (1 Cor. 13:9-10).
3. When he wants to do good, sin lies near (Rom. 7:21).

Objections

1. *The godly desire and pray that they may be perfect; therefore, they can be (1 Thess. 5:23).* Reply. They desire greater perfection since they feel themselves and their works to be imperfect.
2. *It is often commanded that we should not sin at all.* Reply. It tells us what we should do, not what we can do.
3. *Therefore all good works merit damnation.* Reply. Yes, if God acted with us according to justice. Objection. *Who then can be persuaded to do good works?* Reply. The godly who know that their works in Christ, although imperfect, do please God.

Chapter 16

The Church

§I. The word “Church” properly signifies a multitude and assembly, whether it is *political* (Acts 19:32, 39-40), *of wicked men* (Ps. 26:5), or *of saints* gathered together to worship God (1 Tim. 3:15). The meaning “assembly of saints” became most common and is now the only meaning of “Church.”

§II. But since all these saints can be considered either as *one body* or as *divided into particular assemblies*, the name “Church” sometimes means the *whole body* of the saints (Acts 20:28) and sometimes its *parts* (Acts 9:31).

§III. The Church as one body is the *assembly of those men who have been elected by the Father, redeemed by the Son, and sanctified by the Spirit* (1 Pet. 1:2).

§IV. And this Church is one, holy, and catholic (Jn. 10:16).

§V. Its head is only Christ the Mediator:

1. By reason of dignity;
2. By rule;
3. By an infusion (*influxus*) [of power], by which he directs the Church as His own body (Eph. 1:22).

§VI. And since the members of this body are partly in heaven and partly on the earth, the first distinction of the Church is into *triumphant* and *militant* (Heb. 12:23).

§VII. The Church militant is *the assembly of called men who believe the divine truth in the heart, confess it from the mouth, and promise to have communion with the saints* (Acts 2:41-42).

§VIII. And the Church militant can also be considered either as a body dispersed through the whole earth or as its members gather into particular assemblies (1 Cor. 1:2).

§IX. And since particular members gather publicly to worship God, there arises a twofold state of the Church. The first is *internal* and invisible union with Christ, and the second is *external* and visible union with one another (1 Cor. 12:12-13).

§X. Reprobates and hypocrites imitate the external state and the works to be performed in it, but that does not make them members of the true Church (Gal. 2:4).

§XI. The benefits that are said to be established for and promised to the Church pertain only to the members of Christ.

§XII. Particular Churches are properly visible and are distinguished by marks.

Controversy 1 – *Is the name “Church” and “one Church” given in the Word of God not only to an individual assembly which gathers in one place, but also to the whole body of the faithful who profess the truth?* We affirm against the Independents.¹

Arguments

1. All confessors constitute one body ecclesiastically [*ecclesiasticum*]; therefore, they are one Church (1 Cor. 12:13, 27; Eph. 4:11-12).
2. That whole body is said to be one flock (Jn. 10:16), one house (1 Tim. 3:15), the temple of God (2 Thess. 2:4), and the heritage (*clerus*) of the Lord (1 Pet. 5:2-3).
3. The visible Church is also the bride of Christ and the Mother of the faithful, but a bride or Mother is one thing (Song of Sol. 6:9, Gal. 4:26).
4. Decrees are established and sent out in the name of one Church (Acts 15:22).
5. Those who convert are said to be added to the Church (in the singular) (Acts 2:47); therefore, it is considered to be one body.
6. God is said to be praised in the Church (Eph. 3:10, 21; Heb. 2:12); therefore, all churches make one external Church.

Objection

1. *Tell the Church (Mt. 18:17)*. Reply. We concede that the word “Church” can be used for a particular division of an assembly, but then it should also be conceded that it can refer to the whole body.

¹ This refers to the various congregational Churches that existed in the Netherlands, America, and England.

Controversy 2 – *Are the ungodly, hypocrites, and reprobates, who profess the truth externally, also true members of the Church of Christ? We deny against the Papists.*²

Arguments

1. They are expressly called “*false brothers*” (Gal. 2:4) and “*out of us but not of us*” (1 Jn. 2:19); therefore, they are not true members of the Church.
2. True members are the sheep of Christ (Jn. 10:3, 16), but hypocrites are not.
3. Those who do not have Christ as head are not members of the Church (Eph. 5:23), but the ungodly and hypocrites do not have Christ as head.
4. The ungodly and hypocrites are members of the devil; therefore, they are not members of the true Church (Jn. 8:44).

Objections

1. *The Church is compared to a place, a dragnet, a sheepfold, and a house in which there are good and bad things (Matt. 3:12, 13:47).* Reply. We concede that there are evil men *in* the external Church, but they are not *of* the Church.
2. *There are also branches in Christ who do not produce fruit; therefore, evil men can be members of Christ and the Church (Jn. 15:2).* Reply. They are not said to be in Christ, but this refers to the confessors of Christ, because if they are in Christ and do not produce fruit by the love of Christ, they will be cut off.
3. *They have been baptized (Acts 8:13).* Reply. They only have the sign.
4. *If the Church is made up only of the elect and believers, then no one can know the Church or join himself to it.* Reply. We can know the external assembly, and we can join those who profess the truth.

Controversy 3 – *Can someone who is not yet baptized, excommunicated, a schismatic, or not a member of the visible Church be a member of the catholic Church and the body of Christ? We affirm against the Papists.*

² “The goal of the Papists is that no other Church except that which has the Bishop of Rome as its head may be acknowledged. The importance of this controversy is such that on its decision many other controversies depend which are agitated between us and the Papists,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 196.

Arguments

1. They can be sheep of Christ (Jn. 10:16), people of God (Acts 18:10), elect, and sanctified; therefore, they can be members of the catholic Church and the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13).
2. They can have true faith and be truly godly (Matt. 8:10, 15:28; Acts 10:1-2). Those who have these things are members of Christ.
3. They can be saved like the thief on the cross (Lk. 23:43), but only the sheep of Christ are saved (Matt. 25:33).
4. Christians are often unjustly excommunicated (Jn. 9:25, 31; 3 Jn. 10).

Objections

1. *We are initiated into the Church for the first time by baptism.* Reply. Into the visible Church as a sign of profession, but we are engrafted into Christ by the Spirit, which also may occur before baptism.
2. *An excommunicated person is like a Gentile (Matt. 18:17).* Reply. In that he cannot be admitted to the table, but it can happen that someone can be a brother inwardly even though he is considered to be a Gentile (2 Thess. 3:14).
3. *A part that is broken off from the body is not still a part of the body.* Reply. They are indeed broken off from a particular, visible Church but not always from the universal, invisible Church.

§XIII. The Church is said to be *visible*:

1. In relation to its *material*, or the persons of which it consists.
2. In relation to its *parts* or particular assemblies.
3. In relation to its *external form* and rule.

But it is *invisible* in relation to its *internal form*, such as true faith, and therefore the whole mystical body of Christ is invisible.

Controversy – *Is the Church in this world sometimes so obscured, diminished, and suppressed, that no congregation clearly appears in public or is known by its enemies and the world?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The Church in the O.T. was diminished and obscured in this way (1 K. 19:14, 18; 2 K. 17:29; 2 Chr. 15:3).
2. This also happened at the time of Christ, when all were offended (Matt. 26:31) and convening in secret (Jn. 20:9, Acts 1:13).

3. It has been predicted that the Church will flee into the desert, out of the view of its enemies (Rev. 12:6, 14) while the whole world worships the Antichrist (Rev. 13:7, 14).
4. The Papists, who imagine that they are the true Church, can be secretly among us, so that we are unaware of their gatherings.

Objections

1. *You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden (Mt. 5:14).* Reply. This does not refer to the Church but to Pastors, who illuminate the world by the preaching of the Word and have been exposed to the eyes and censure of all as a city on a hill, but they can be diminished and die.
2. *“Tell the Church” (Mt. 18:17).* Reply. This is not said to the enemies of the Church but its members, and the Church is sufficiently known to those who are in the Church.
3. *We must join ourselves to it.* Reply. At the time that we can seek it out.
4. *It is the house of God (1 Tim. 3:15).* Reply. It can be a house that is not known to any except those who are in the house such as the underground Church at Rome.
5. *There are Pastors, Teachers, and others in her.* Reply. They can also exist in a Church that is small and hiding.

§XIV. God preserves the Church in the following ways:

1. He always preserves the universal, invisible Church.
2. He always reserves for Himself a particular, instituted Church in some part of the world.
3. But He does not perpetually preserve a Church in the same place but sometimes in one place and at other times in another.

§XV. The Church can be said to fail (*deficere*) in three areas:

1. In *doctrine* by falling into errors.
2. In *life* by committing sins.
3. In *place*, when it falls (*decidit*), is expelled, or the confessors die.

Controversy 1 – *Can any particular, visible Church, including Rome, err or fall into errors?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The Church before Christ was able to err (Ex. 32:2, 2 K. 23:22, Neh. 8:17).
2. The Church, when Christ died, was able to err, whether it is called “Church” in relation to the Pharisees or the Apostles.

3. Particular Churches are rebuked because of errors (1 Cor. 1:12, 11:18, 15:13; Gal. 1:6, 3:1; Rev. 2:20).
4. The knowledge of all men is imperfect; therefore, they can err (1 Cor. 13:9).
5. Because of this, they are warned that they must watch themselves lest they be seduced (2 Thess. 2:3, 2 Cor. 11:3).
6. They can sin; therefore, they can also err.

Objections

1. *It is the pillar of truth (1 Tim. 3:15).* Reply. As long as it teaches the truth, but this does not prevent it from being able to sin and err.
2. *The Church has the Spirit (Jn. 16:13).* Reply. Peter and every individual believer have the Spirit, but they are nevertheless able to err.
3. *We ought to believe the Church (Mt. 18).* Reply. As long as it proclaims to us the Word of God.
4. *The Church is holy.* Reply. So was Adam, but he was still able to err.

Controversy 2 – *Is the majority of the visible Church on earth, either scattered abroad or gathered in a Synod, able to fall into errors and heresies?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. In the O.T., a majority of the Church often erred (Ex. 32; Jer. 5:31, 6:13; 1 K. 22:6).
2. A majority of the Synagogue at the time of Christ also conquered the better part (Jn. 9:21, 12:42), and the Apostles themselves erred (Mt. 16:22; Acts 1:6, 10, 14, 18, 11:2).
3. A majority of Confessors at various times taught chiliastic fables about the thousand year reign, that the Eucharist was to be given to infants, that second marriages were evil, and that souls in the day of judgment would not delight in the vision of God; and fell into Arianism.
4. Our adversaries admit that “the number of hypocrites could increase to such a degree that there are more secret heretics than true and sincere catholics.”³

³ Bellarmine, *Disputationes*, Lib. 3, “De Ecclesia Militante,” Ch. 10.

Objections

1. *The Church is governed by Christ as Head.* Reply. So are individual believers, but they still can err.
2. *“I have prayed for you that your faith might not fail” (Luke 22:32).* Reply. He prayed that Peter would remain faithful, but he was still able to err (Gal. 2:14).

Controversy 3 – *Can any particular Church, including Rome, cease from one place in the course of time, so that there would be no true Church in that place?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. In the Old Testament, particular Churches ceased (Is. 1:2, Jer. 7:12, Mt. 21:43).
2. The first Churches of Asia have for the most part ceased: the Antiochene, the Alexandrian, etc.
3. Because it has been said to the Ephesian Church: “I will remove your candlestick from its place” (Rev. 2:5), this can also be said and happen to other Churches.
4. It has been expressly said to the Roman Church, “Do not be proud, as if you could not err, but fear...for God will not spare you either...otherwise, you will be cut off” (see Rom. 11:20-22).
5. Germany, Switzerland, England, Denmark, the Netherlands, and others have defected from the papacy; therefore, the Roman Church can also cease in its place. And as it has departed from those places, so it could cease in Italy.

Objections

1. *It is a pillar of truth.* Reply. Not the Roman Church. The true Church remains a pillar of truth, even if it moves from place to place.
2. *He has founded it forever (Ps. 48:8).* Reply. Not the Church of Rome but the mystical body of Christ.
3. *The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* Reply. This means: the Church will not be condemned. But the faithful can die, and the ungodly can succeed to their place.

Controversy 4 – *Will a true Church and true believers always exist in the world so that the Church cannot fail to the point that it does not survive in some place?* We affirm against the Socinians.⁴

Arguments

1. Christ's Kingdom and His true worshipers will always survive (Ps. 72:5, 17; 89:37; Dan. 2:44; Lk. 1:33).
2. Pastors and sacraments will survive in the Church to the end of the world (Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:26).
3. The world would perish, if the Church did not survive in any place "Then it will be the end" (1 Cor. 15:25, cf. Rev. 6:11).
4. The condition of the Church at the end of the world is described in the book of Revelation.

Objections

1. *Every believer and every particular Church can cease.* Reply. Such that men can die, but new believers will succeed those who went before.
2. *Babylon makes all peoples drink of the wine of her adulteries (Rev. 14:8).* Reply. All "whose names have not been written in the Book of Life (Rev. 13:8).
3. *Religion is a free matter, and so all can renounce it.* Reply. On the contrary, it is a necessary matter, in which believers understand that they cannot in any way abstain from it (Acts 4:20).

§XVI. The necessity of joining ourselves to the Church is threefold:

1. By *command*, since God commanded it.
2. As *external means*, that we might edify our neighbors and ourselves.
3. As a *sign*, that we might separate ourselves from the profane.

Controversy – *Should everyone seek out the true Church and join it?* We affirm against the Libertines and Socinians.⁵

⁴ "Here we deal with the Socinians and other enemies of the perseverance of the saints, who, defending the apostasy of the saints, maintain that the perpetual existence of the church in the world is contingent, not necessary," Turretin, *Institutes*, XVIII:viii.4.

⁵ "We must make a continual distinction between in the controversies with the Papists and the Socinians. The Papists say too much; the Socinians say too little. The Papists exalt the Church too highly; the Socinians make it too low. The Papists extol the power and dignity of the Church vigorously; the Socinians make light of it and overthrow it," Hoornbeeck, *Socinianismi Confutati Compendium*, 857.

1. Because God gathers the Church so that he who desires to be saved should join himself to it (Acts 2:47, Eph. 4:11-12).
2. Those who disdain and desert the Church are severely rebuked (1 Cor. 11:22; Heb. 10:25, 38; 1 Jn. 2:19).
3. Pastors should preach publicly (2 Tim. 4:2). Believers should receive the Word (James 1:21). Believers ought to obey their leaders (Heb. 13:17). Therefore, they ought to join themselves to the Church.
4. We ought to make use of the sacraments in the Church; therefore, we ought to join ourselves to it (1 Cor. 11:24).

Objections

1. *To obtain salvation, it is enough to observe the commands of Christ.*
Reply. It is also a command of Christ that we join ourselves to the Church, "Tell the Church" (Mt. 18:17). "Go, teach" (28:19).
2. *Whoever believes will be saved.* Reply. Faith is by hearing the Word in the Church (Rom. 10:17).

§XVII. The true Church is known by its marks, which are external signs clearly and certainly showing that it is the true Church, such as the confession of the truth.

Controversies 1-3 Concerning the Marks of the Church

Controversy 1 – *Are or can there be any such marks of the true Church?*
We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. Holy Scripture expressly sets forth marks and deduces a true Church from the true marks (1 Jn. 4:2; Jn. 8:32, 13:35).
2. The false Church is demonstrated to be false by a lack of the true marks (Rev. 2:2, 9; Rom. 11:18).
3. If there were no marks, no one could distinguish the true Church from the false contrary to 1 Tim. 3:15, nor would it be necessary to prove all things contrary to 1 Thess. 5:21 and 1 John. 4:1.
4. The doctrine of Christ is a mark; therefore, we can conclude from this as a mark whether this or that particular Church is a true one or not (1 Jn. 5:10).

Objections

1. *The preaching of the Word constitutes the essence of the Church; therefore, it is not a mark.* Reply. Externally; therefore, it is a mark, just as the form of a man shows the man.
2. *The preaching of the Word is not more knowable than the Church.* Reply. It first ought to be known how we can know whether this congregation is a true Church.⁶

Controversy 2 – *Is the confession of the truth with the proper use of the sacraments a true mark of the visible⁷ Church?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

The confession of the truth agrees with the definition of a mark. It is an external sign, inseparable from the Church, and necessarily convinces.

1. It is an external sign (Rom. 10:10; Jn. 8:31, 10:27).
2. It is an inseparable sign (1 Jn. 5:2, 1 Tim. 3:15).
3. It is a sign that certainly convinces; for where that mark is, there is the true Church (Jn. 8:31, 15:7). Where the truth is not confessed, there is a false Church (Gal. 1:8, 2 Tim. 2:18).
4. It is expressly set forth as a sign. “By this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error” (1 Jn. 4:6).

Objections

1. *Everyone ascribes it to themselves.* Reply. But falsely.
2. *This mark is more unknown than the Church.* Reply. Perhaps than a particular congregation of men, but that congregation cannot be known to be a true Church, except by this mark.
3. *The Churches of Corinth and Galatia were true Churches, but the sincere preaching of the Word was not there (Gal.).* Reply. Insofar

⁶ “It is one thing to be knowable by nature, another thing to be known to us. Scripture is more knowable than the Church by nature because it is its principle and foundation. The Church cannot be certainly and infallibly known except by Scripture. The Church is more knowable than the Scripture to us by our confused and beginner’s knowledge because it is the medium and instrument that leads us to the Scripture and the Scripture to us,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 205.

⁷ I have used the wording of the Turretin, *Compendium* instead of Rijssen, *Summa Theologiae Elencticae*, 293, which has “instituted (*institutae*)” in the same place that the *Compendium* has “visible,” 204.

as they remained in error, they were not true Churches but erring ones.

Controversy 3 - *Are antiquity, duration, distribution, succession, miracles, blessings, virtues, etc. true marks of the Church?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. *They are not uniquely (proprie) marks of the Church.* Antiquity, distribution, blessings, and the like can also exist in the false and heretical Church.
2. *They do not always agree with the Church.* For the Christian Church at the time of Christ was not ancient, distributed, or prosperous, and did not have a succession of teachers.
3. And these do not agree with the Papist Churches.

Controversies 1-5 concerning the Head of the Church

Controversy 1 – *Can any man can be the head of the whole Church because of internal influx⁸ and gifts of grace?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Because only God through Christ distributes gifts of grace (1 Cor. 12:5-9).
2. He who would give grace to all ought to be omnipotent and omniscient.
3. He ought to be able to guard believers by His hand and carry them to glory, which he cannot do (Jn. 10:28).
4. By the death of that man, all influx of grace would cease, and the Church would apostatize.

Controversy 2 – *Can any man, besides Christ, be the head of the Church as to external rule; that is, should the Church be ruled by one visible king after Christ?* We deny against the same.

1. It is expressly said that in the world there may be kings, but in the Church there will not be (Mt. 20:25-27, Lk. 22:25-26).
2. The power of the Church has not been given to one but many (Mt. 18:18, Jn. 20:23, Acts 15:22).

⁸ See above, §V, p. 198.

3. All Pastors are *Ministers* not *Lords* of the Church (2 Cor. 4:5, 1 Pt. 5:3).
4. Where the ecclesiastical offices are enumerated, there is no mention of any such monarch (1 Cor. 12:29, Eph. 4:11).
5. Only Christ is and remains the Head and Lord of the Church.

Objections

1. *The Jewish Church was always governed by one visible head, the High Priest; therefore, the Church ought to be ruled this way today.*
Reply. The High Priest was a figure of Christ alone. After Christ has come, the shadows ought to vanish.
2. *The Church is compared with a well-organized army, a kingdom, a sheepfold, a house, and a human body: therefore, it ought to have a head.* Reply. That head is Christ.
3. *Christ, when living on earth, was the visible head of the Church.*
Reply. He remains what He was. Today, He also reigns visibly through Ministers. 2. He did not want to institute another head beside Himself.

Controversy 3 – *Was Peter instituted by Christ in the place of Christ as the Monarch of the whole Church to whose power all Apostles and believers were subjected?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. When a contention sprang up amongst the Apostles concerning who would be the leader and head, Christ prohibited the despotism of one (Lk. 22:25-26).
2. When some of the Corinthians set up Paul and others Peter as head, Paul rebuked them (1 Cor. 1:12).
3. All Apostles have been sent with equal power: “As the Father sent Me, I send you” (Jn. 20:21, 23; Mt. 28:19).
4. All the Apostles are called equally the foundation of the Church (Eph. 2:20, Rev. 21:14).
5. Paul did not want to be less in anything than Peter (2 Cor. 11:5), but he gave him the right hand of friendship (Gal. 2:9).
6. Peter was not acknowledged on any occasion as a monarch, but he was sent to the Churches (Acts 8:14), and rebuked for a trivial cause and then forced to give an explanation (Acts 11:3).
7. It is said to Peter himself, “Tell the Church” (Mt. 18:17, 21).

Objections

1. *You are Peter, and upon this rock I will build the Church.* Reply. But the rock is Christ (1 Cor. 10:4, Eph. 2:20).
2. *The keys of the kingdom have been given to Peter (Mt. 16:19).* Reply. No. They have been given to all (Mt. 18:18, Jn. 20:23).
3. *Feed my lambs (Jn. 21:15).* Reply. It is the duty of all Pastors (1 Pet. 5:2).
4. *He is mentioned first.* Reply. Sometimes he is not (Jn. 1:45; 1 Cor. 1:12, 3:22, 9:5; Gal. 2:9).

Controversy 4 – *Was Peter a Roman Bishop?* We deny against the same.

1. The Apostles were not such Bishops, but their office was distinct from the office of Pastors (1 Cor. 12:28-29, Eph. 4:11).
2. *Paul* was an Apostle of the Gentiles as *Peter* to the circumcision (Gal. 2:7-9).
3. If Peter had been Bishop of Rome, then Paul would have greeted him in his letter to the Romans, but he did not (Rom. 16).
4. Paul writing from Rome said that no one could be found there more faithful than Timothy (Phil. 2:26). He did not have any other helpers than “Mark and Justus” (Col. 4:10-11). *Luke* alone was with him (2 Tim. 4:11). In his first defense no one was a help to him (2 Tim. 4:16). Therefore, Peter was not there, much less a Bishop.

Objections

1. *Peter first preached to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7).* Reply. There were many other Gentiles besides the Romans, nor was he a Bishop in all the places that he preached.
2. *“The Church which is in Babylon greets you” (1 Pet. 5:13).* Reply. This is said literally not mystically as is common in the subscription of the Epistles.
3. *Peter was killed in Rome.* Reply. These two things, if they were true, do not prove that Peter was the Bishop there.

Controversy 5 – *Is the Roman Pope the successor of Peter and head of the whole Church?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. Peter was neither Bishop of Rome nor Pope; therefore, no one can succeed him.

2. After Peter's death not Linus or Clement but John or another Apostle should have succeeded him.
3. No one succeeded the Apostles in the apostolate.
4. The Pope is not even a member of the Church but the Antichrist.

Objections

1. *A succession is necessary in the Church.* Reply. It is necessary in doctrine in the whole Church but not of the apostolic office or of teachers in the same place.
2. *It can be proved from Councils and the Fathers.* Reply. It should be proved from the Word of God.

Controversies 1-3 Concerning the Antichrist⁹

Controversy 1 – *Is the great Antichrist only one person?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. There are said to be many Antichrists (1 Jn. 2:18).
2. Antichrist began at the time of Paul (2 Thes. 2:7) and John (1 Jn. 4:3), but he would last until the end of the world; therefore...
3. A kingdom would occupy the place of the emperor (Rev. 13:12); therefore, it is no more one person than the beast that it succeeds.
4. The things which are recounted concerning the Antichrist in Revelation cannot be carried out by one man.

Objections

1. *He will only reign for a time, times, and half a time, which means three and a half years (Rev. 12:14).* Reply. This is a false explanation. This is not referring to the time of the Antichrist but to the protection of the Church from his tyranny.
2. *In 2 Thess. 2, Rev. 13, and other places, he is described as one person.* Reply. Only one person reigns at a time, but others succeed him as in all monarchies.
3. *If another comes in his name (Jn. 5:43).* Reply. *Another (alius)* does not refer merely to one person but to all who come in this way as in John. 4:37.

⁹ "The faith of all the Reformed and Protestants is constant on this point. The great Antichrist described in Paul and John is the Roman Pope," Turretin, *Compendium*, 213.

Controversy 2 - *Has the great Antichrist now come?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. Because Caesar, who was holding him back, lost his power in Italy a long time ago (see 2 Thes. 2:8).
2. The Pope succeeded to Caesar's place and seized his power for himself; therefore, he has already come (Rev. 13:12).
3. The Roman Empire has already been divided into ten kingdoms, which could not occur until the manifestation of the Antichrist (Rev. 17:12).

Objections

1. *There is still a Roman Emperor.* Reply. In name, not in reality, and thus he ought to be superseded (Rev. 13:12).
2. *Enoch and Elijah have not yet come (Rev. 11:3).* Reply. We do not read that this is future. Enoch and Elijah refer to the true teachers of the true Church who suffered persecution during the reign of the Antichrist.
3. *Antichrist will finally come at the end of the world.* Reply. He is called by Christ to the Day of Judgment in the last time.

Controversy 3 - *Is the Roman Pope the great Antichrist of whom the Holy Scripture speaks?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

All these marks of the Antichrist conform to him:

1. He had to sit in Rome (Rev. 17:9, 18).
2. He was to be the seventh King as to his manner of ruling and thus was to succeed the Emperor (Rev. 17:11, 13:12; 2 Thes. 2:4).
3. He had to have the horns of the Lamb or pretend the power of Christ (Rev. 13:11).
4. He had to sit in the Church as God or claim for himself divine authority (2 Thes. 2:4).
5. He had to show signs and miracles (2 Thess. 2:9-10, Rev. 13:14). These and the other marks fit with the Pope.

Objections

1. *The seat of the Antichrist will be in the city in which Christ was crucified (Rev. 11:8).* Reply. It says He was "spiritually" crucified, which occurs everywhere where his doctrine is suppressed.

2. *He must be a Jew from the tribe of Dan and be received by the Jews as the Messiah.* Reply. These are trifles and fables of Bellarmine.
3. *He had to extol himself above God and deny Christ.* Reply. He does this when He nullifies the commandments of God and overthrows the offices of Christ.
4. *He must persecute the saints.* Reply. He has also always done this.

§XVIII. The *ordinary* Ministers in the Old Testament were the High Priest, the Priests, the Levites, and the Scribes. The *extraordinary* Ministers were the Prophets.

§XIX. In the New Testament the *ordinary* Ministers are the Pastors, Elders, and Deacons. The *extraordinary* Ministers were the Apostles and Prophets (1 Cor. 12:28).

§XX. The power of the Church is fourfold:

1. Calling Pastors.
2. Preaching the Word of God.
3. Administering the sacraments.
4. Exercising discipline.

§XXI. But calling is established in a twofold way:

1. *Internally*, by which God gives a heart (*animum*) for the office and the requisite gifts.
2. *Externally*, to which pertains:
 - a. Election by the Church.
 - b. Examination.
 - c. Confirmation.

Controversies 1-9 Concerning the Ministers of the Church

Controversy 1 –*Is the calling of Ministers now necessary? That is, can no one be Pastor of a Church and administer the sacraments unless he has been called to this by the Church?* We affirm against the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Arminians.

Arguments

1. Scripture requires calling (Rom. 10:15, Heb. 5:4-5).
2. Those who are not called are rebuked (Jer. 23:21).
3. Christ and the Apostles commanded it (Mt. 28:19, 2 Tim. 2:2, Tit. 1:5).
4. They ought to be ambassadors and stewards of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4:1) and therefore ought to be called.

5. Deacons have to be called; therefore, much more must Pastors be called (Acts 6:5-6, 2 Tim. 3:10ff.).

Objections

1. *It is a work of love.* Reply. And also a work of a special office.
2. *It is permitted to anyone to desire to be a Bishop.* Reply. It is permitted to anyone to desire this in the proper way but not to enter it without calling.
3. *Philip baptized (Acts 8:38).* Reply. He had the special command of the Holy Spirit, had been called to the diaconate, and beyond that was an *evangelist* (21:8).
4. *The Passover was celebrated by the fathers of households.* Reply. Why was it so at that time? Because it seemed good to God to ordain this.

Controversy 2 – *Besides election and calling of the people to perform an ecclesiastical office, is it necessary also to have commission, ordination, and institution?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. The same as the above arguments.
2. It follows from the laying on of hands (1 Tim. 4:14, 5:22; Heb. 6:1-2).
3. The people themselves do not have the authority to preach or to administer the sacraments; therefore, none of them can give it.
4. It is an office that must be exercised with power and authority; therefore, that power ought to be given.

Objections

1. *Election by the Church is foundational to the ministry.* Reply. It is the foundation (*principium*) of the ministry in that place but not the foundation of that power in every place where that office is to be exercised.
2. *Election forms a bond (conjugem).*¹⁰ Reply. That also requires confirmation.
3. *What if there is no one who can confirm it?* Reply. This case is false and does not happen.
4. *This leads to the succession of the Papists.* Reply. No, since we do not say that succession is a mark of the Church, perpetual in one place, or necessary to be known.

¹⁰ Between the Church and the pastor.

5. *Presbyters were created by vote (Acts 14:23).* Reply. They were elected, but the Apostles confirmed those who were elected.

Controversy 3 – *Did the first Reformers, Luther, Calvin, and others, have a legitimate calling?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. They were qualified, called by the Church, approved by the Magistrate, and, originally, appointed by the Roman Church itself to teach.

Objections

1. *Then the Roman Church is a true Church.* Reply. Originally, it was, and later it became impure, however, it did perform this according to the Word of God, that it called ministers.
2. *They were not confirmed by Bishops following the ordinary rituals.* Reply. It was not necessary.

But their calling can be called *extraordinary*:

- a. Insofar as God gave them extraordinary gifts.
- b. From an extraordinary impulse of the Holy Spirit.
- c. Insofar as God used them for an extraordinary work.

Controversy 4 – *Do Bishops exist by divine right? In other words, did Christ institute as Pastor anyone who would have power in other Churches or Rulers of Churches whose power alone it would be to call Pastors, administer sacraments, and exercise discipline?* We deny against the Papists, the Anabaptists, and others.¹¹

Arguments

1. All Ministers are equal in power. No lordship is allowed (Lk. 22:25-26, 1 Cor. 3:5, 1 Pet. 5:2).
2. Bishop, Pastor, and Presbyter are the same thing (Acts 20:20, 28; Tit. 1:5, 7ff.; 1 Pet. 5:1-2; 1 Tim. 5:17).
3. There were many Bishops in one and the same Church (Phil. 1:1; Acts 20:17, 28).

¹¹ “This question exists not only between us and the Papists who uphold this as the foundation of their hierarchy but also with various Protestants. But we grant that there is a wide difference between the two because the antichristian tyranny that the Papists have constructed over consciences is very far from the Protestants. However, they both agree that Bishops are established as superiors over Presbyters in power of ordination and jurisdiction,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 219.

4. Their office is one and the same (1 Tim. 3:1, 8), to rule (Heb. 13:17).
5. Councils are of divine right, and God has committed the rule of the Church to the Council not to one Bishop (Acts 14:23, 1 Tim. 4:14).

Objections

1. *The Apostles, to whom the Bishops are successors, were above the 70 disciples.* Reply. Insofar as they were Apostles and extraordinary Ministers no one succeeded them. Those who succeeded them, succeeded in the common and ordinary office.
2. *Timothy and Titus were Bishops.* Reply. And as Bishops, they are the same as a Presbyter.
3. *Although there were many who were Pastors, it was written to one Angel in Rev. 2 & 3.* Reply. That many were not one is not proven. "Angel" refers to the whole Council.

Controversy 5 – *Does the power of electing Pastors and Ministers for the Church belong to any Magistrate or Bishop, or is it in the power of the Church?* We deny the former and affirm the latter.

Arguments

1. The keys of the kingdom of heaven have not been given to the Magistrate or the Bishop alone but to the whole Church (Mt. 18:18).
2. At the time of the Apostles, neither the Magistrate nor Bishop but the Council elected Ministers (Acts 1:23, 6:3, 14:23).
3. If they were elected by the Magistrate, they would be elected as Ministers of men contrary to Galatians 1:10.

Objections

1. *Sheep cannot elect a shepherd.* Reply. Rational sheep can.
2. *Solomon deposed Abiathar (1 Kings 2:26).* Reply. He sent him into exile because he had committed a political sin.
3. *The Apostles sent Pastors here and there without the consent of the Church.* Reply. Where there was no Church, a Church was not able to give its consent.

Controversy 6 – *Is the monastic life holy? In other words, is it not only permitted but also a work of singular holiness to segregate oneself from the community of men, be celibate, and bind oneself to a distinct dress?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. God has nowhere commanded it; therefore, it cannot be a good work (Col. 2:22-23).
2. It is not permitted for a man to go away from the world or to completely flee from human society (1 Cor. 5:10).
3. Because these men do not love their neighbor or desire to edify him contrary to Phil. 2:4; 1 Thes. 5:11, 14; and Heb. 10:25.
4. These men make holiness consist in ridiculous things such as a *shaved head, a unique form of dress, fabricated voluntary poverty, and food and drink* contrary to Rom. 14:17.
5. They fall into the many temptations and traps of the devil which solitary life often brings.

Objections

1. *Elijah, Elisha, and John the Baptist were hermits and monks.*
Reply. These are all false examples. They possessed goods, but sometimes when God called them to relinquish the use of them as extraordinary Ministers, they did so.
2. *They had all things in common (Acts 2:44).* Reply. No one gave up the use of these things. They had their own houses and goods, "They went from house to house" (v. 46).
3. *When they want to marry, they deny their first faith (1 Tim. 5:12).*
Reply. The first faith is the Christian religion, since they were going back to Judaism.
4. *The Recabites were monks (Jer. 35).* Reply. This is false. They had wives, sons, and daughters (v. 8).

Controversy 7 – *Is it a divine institution that in the Church there would be Elders who rule but do not teach?* We affirm against the Arminians and Papists.

Arguments

1. Elders who only rule are clearly distinguished from those who both teach and rule (1 Tim. 5:17, 1 Cor. 12:28).
2. The Council consists of these rulers and Pastors (1 Tim. 4:14, Mt. 18:17, Acts 14:23).
3. They were also part of the Council (Acts 15:2, 6, 22, 16:4).

Objections

1. *They are Laity.* Reply. The distinction between laity and clergy is a Papist fabrication.

2. *They ought to be teachers and able to watch over the Church (Acts 20:28).* Reply. They certainly are as to admonishing and ruling but not as to public preaching (*concionandum*).

Controversy 8 – *Are Ministers or Pastors of the Church owed a wage? We affirm against the Anabaptists.*

Arguments

1. It says that they are worthy of a reward as workers (Mt. 10:10-11, 1 Tim. 5:18).
2. Those who are taught ought to share good things with their teachers (Gal. 6:6, Tit. 3:13).
3. The Apostles received wages (Lk. 8:3; 2 Cor. 11:8; Phil. 4:10, 15-16).
4. They have authority to stop working and ask for pay and remuneration (1 Cor. 9:6ff., Rom. 15:27).

Objections

1. *They ought to give freely (Mt. 10:8).* Reply. Miracles and healing of the sick, but they are owed other things as Pastors (v. 10).
2. *The Apostles did not want wages (Acts 20:33, 2 Thes. 3:8).* Reply. Although they did not want to ask in certain places, they had the right of asking.
3. *They are mercenaries and greedy.* Reply. This is a calumny.

Controversy 9 – *Are Ecclesiastical persons subject to the Magistrate, namely, in following their commands, in paying tribute, and in judgment, if they sin? We affirm against the Papists.*

Arguments

1. In the Old Testament, the Ministers of the Church were subject to Kings (1 K. 1:32, 2:27; 2 Chron. 31:2).
2. Christ Himself also subjected Himself to the Magistrate (Mt. 17:25, Gal. 4:4, Jn. 19:11).
3. The Apostles themselves acknowledged Judges (Acts 25:10).
4. All souls ought to be subject to the Magistrates whether they are believers or unbelievers (Rom. 13:1, 7; 1 Pet. 2:13; Mt. 22:21).
5. The kingdom of Christ is not of this world (Jn. 18:36); therefore, it does not seize any political privilege of the Prince and give it to the Clergy.

Objections

1. *The shepherd should not be judged by the sheep nor the father by his sons.* Reply. He should, if the son is a Judge.
2. *The Clergy bind princes (Ps. 149:8), and they owe obedience (Heb. 13:17).* Reply. Insofar as the Clergy expound the Word of God not as superiors in government.
3. *The fields of the Priests were not sold (Gen. 47:22).* Reply. It was not necessary because they were actually the King's property.
4. *The children of the kingdom are free (Mt. 17:26).* Reply. Kings free their own children, which they may freely do to the Clergy, if they want to.

§XXII. Ecclesiastical assemblies are twofold:

1. *Minor* assemblies or Councils of each Church.
2. *Major* assemblies or assemblies of Churches by classes [presbyteries, local regional divisions] or synods, but they are not distinguished in the Word of God.

Controversy 1 – *Should there not be any larger Church than that which can assemble in one place to hear the Word of God?* We deny against the Independents.

Arguments

1. Because the Apostolic Churches such as those in Jerusalem, Corinth, and elsewhere, which were composed of thousands of men and were not able to hear a Pastor in one place, were one Church (Acts 4:4, 6:1, 21:20, 22).
2. The unity of the Council makes a Church not the outward capacity of the place.
3. Thus the Churches under the cross, if they have one Council, have one Church, even though they are forced to gather to convene in various places.
4. Otherwise the louder voice of the Preacher, the more the Church would increase, and the quieter the voice, the smaller the Church would be.
5. Otherwise when the number of the Church was complete, no one could be added to it.

Objections

1. *The Churches are said to come together in the same place (Acts 2:44 and elsewhere).* Reply. This refers sometimes to the leaders of the

- Church and at other times to the congregation itself but not to the place because they gathered in various places to do the same work.
2. *It is a nuisance to the edification of the Church, since the members cannot assemble for the communion of the saints.* Reply. Therefore many Ministers are ordained but not many churches.

Controversy 2 – *Are these major assemblies of divine right?* We affirm against the Socinians, Arminians, and Episcopalians.

Arguments

1. It is proved by examples (Acts 1, 15).
2. The Old Testament had its Council and synagogues.
3. It is a natural right that whatever an individual person or Church cannot resolve may be done by many.

Objections

1. *Every Church has all power in itself.* Reply. These powers are not taken away by the classis, but the Church joins with the power of many Churches for determining those things that concern the Churches in common.

§XXXIII. The power of gathering these assemblies is twofold. The first is *internal* and ecclesiastical and ministerial (Acts 15), and the other is *external* and political when the civil ruler commands the Council, Classis, or Synod to be called together.

§XXXIV. The power of these assemblies is to use all ecclesiastical means that are necessary for the edification of the Church, such as making ecclesiastical laws, condemning errors, and punishing the profane.

§XXXV. And this is a spiritual power in relation to its end, means, and objects, for it is occupied with the souls of men that it might dispose them to godliness (2 Cor. 10:4).

§XXXVI. But this power is very different from the power of the Magistrate.

Controversy 1 – *Is the Magistrate qualified to rule the Church?* We deny against the Erastians.¹²

¹² Latin, “*politici*.” This is what Rijssen has in *Summa Theologiae Elencticae*, but Turretin in the *Institutes* has “Erastus and his followers” (XVIII:xxxii). We call the same group “Erastians.” “They want ecclesiastical power to be formally and specifically civil and secular and in the power of the magistrate as its first and proper subject from which that of pastors is derived,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 227.

Arguments

1. Christ gave some prophets, teachers, and Pastors, not Magistrates, for the rule of the Church (Eph. 4:11).
2. Then there would be an altogether magisterial power (*dominium*) in the Church, since the power of the Magistrate is magisterial (*dominii*) contrary to Matthew 20:25 and Luke 22:25.
3. The Church and not the Magistrates have been given the keys of the kingdom of heaven.
4. Then the kingdom of Christ would be of this world, and political power would be a part of His kingdom contrary to John 18:36 and 2 Corinthians 10:4.
5. Then also women and Gentiles would be able to perform ecclesiastical duties, preach, administer sacraments, etc.

Objections

1. *Then it would be an empire within an empire.* Reply. Ecclesiastical power is ministerial not imperial.
2. *Every soul should subject himself to the Magistrate (Rom. 13:1).* Reply. In political matters.

Controversy 2 – *Does the Church have the power of marking out the scandalous with ecclesiastical censures?* We affirm against the same.

Arguments

1. It has been expressly commanded that what is holy should not be given to dogs (Mt. 7:6).
2. Scripture commands us to avoid such people (Rom. 16:27), to keep away from them (Gal. 5:12), to exclude them (Tit. 3:10), and to hand them over to Satan (1 Cor. 5:5).
3. He who does not hear the Church should be considered a Gentile (Mt. 18:17). The Gentiles should not be given the sacred signs.
4. The ungodly do not have a part in the Word of promise (Acts 8:21); therefore, the signs of this Word should not be given to them either.
5. The Apostles did not want to baptize anyone except those who would promise conversion and profess faith (Acts 2:41, 8:37, 16:14-15).

Objections

1. *Christ did not expel Judas.* Reply. As long as his hypocrisy was hidden.

2. *Men today do not have a special revelation of the Holy Spirit.* Reply. But this is not necessary in order to know scandals.

§XXVII. The steps of ecclesiastical censure are:

1. Rebuke.
2. Suspension.
3. Excommunication.

Controversy – *Are ecclesiastical censures, especially the highest, in their essence in the power of the whole Church?* We deny against the Anabaptists and Independents.

Arguments

1. The people have not been ordained as are Bishops and Rulers (1 Cor. 12:29); therefore, they cannot do that which belongs to ruling.
2. The keys of the kingdom have not been given to the people (Mt. 16:19).
3. The people do not have the power to give the sacraments; therefore, they do not have the power not to deny them to anyone.
4. It has been commanded that we tell the Church or the Council and that the Council would then administer the censure (Mt. 18:17).
5. Otherwise, women would be able to rule the Church.

Objections

1. *“Tell the Church” (Mt. 18:17).* Reply. Not to the whole congregation, women, and children but to the Council.
2. *It pleased the Apostles, Presbyters, and the whole Church (Acts 15:22).* Reply. This means the Apostles, the teaching Elders, and the Elders who only rule.
3. *When you (vos) are gathered (1 Cor. 5:4).* Reply. Those who constitute the Council.

Chapter 17

The Sacraments

§I. A sacrament is a divine sign and seal and a visible sign of an invisible grace.

§II. A sign does three things:

1. It represents.
2. It signs and assigns (*addicit*).
3. It seals.

§III. A sacrament is not the mere sign or only the thing signified. The two joined together constitute a sacrament.

§IV. For something to constitute a sacrament there must be:

1. A divine institution and command to use that sign.
2. A promise to give the thing signified to those who rightly use the sign.

Controversy 1 – *Are sacraments not merely signs and shadows of divine grace but also seals that seal grace?* We affirm against the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Papists.¹

Arguments

1. They are expressly called seals (Rom. 4:11, Gen. 17:11).
2. The sacraments have been instituted by God are for confirming the covenant and the promises of the covenant; therefore, they are seals (Gen. 17:11, Mt. 26:28).

¹ “The Socinians indeed confess that the sacraments are distinct signs or testimonies and marks of profession by which we are distinguished from unbelievers, but they deny that they can be seals of the grace of God concerning remission of sins and regeneration. The Papists also deny that the sacraments have any power to be sign and seals of the divine promises. The orthodox do not deny that they are also signs of Christians and testimonies of their profession, but they deny against the Socinians that they are restricted to this, and, besides this less central use, they think that there is a primary one, namely, that they are seals of the grace of God that He wants to be joined to the word of promise just as seals of princes are added to letters of recommendation to make them more certain,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 234.

3. We receive the sacraments that our consciences might become more certain of the remission of sins; therefore, they are seals (Mk. 1:4, Acts 2:38-39).
4. Unless they were seals, there would be no benefit in using them.
5. The use of the Supper is said to be a communion with the body of Christ, but this could not be unless the Supper was instituted to seal that communion (1 Cor. 10:16, 11:24; Rom. 6:4).

Objections

1. *To seal is the work of the Word and the Holy Spirit.* Reply. The Word seals by its declarations; the Spirit does so internally. The sacraments seal the same thing visibly.
2. *They are symbols of our profession.* Reply. On our part. On the part of God, they are symbols of His promises, and they are received by us as such.
3. *They are done in memory of Christ (Lk. 22:19).* Reply. To confirm the memory of Christ and faith in what He performed for us.
4. *Then they would often be false seals.* Reply. They are only signs and seals to saints and believers.
5. *Infants do not have faith; therefore, nothing can be sealed to them.* Reply. They have the Holy Spirit, and this is sealed to them because God wants to be their God.

Controversy 2 – *Were the sacraments of the Old Testament shadows of the sacraments of the New Testament and not seals of grace? We deny against the Papists.*²

Arguments

1. They were seals of the covenant of grace and justification; therefore... (Rom. 4:11, Gen. 17:10-11).
2. They were signs and seals of Christ; therefore, they sealed the same thing (1 Cor. 10:1-2; Heb. 10:1).
3. Since we, participants in the thing signified, are also said to be participants in the signs of the Old Testament, such as circumcision (Col. 2:11) and Passover (1 Cor. 5:7).

² “The Papists disparage the sacraments of the Old saying that they were merely shadows and figures of grace but saying that the sacraments of the New confer and effect grace that they might extol the efficacy of the sacraments of the New Testament and so attain more authority for their ministry,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 237.

Objections

1. *They are said to be shadows and types (Heb. 10:1).* Reply. Not of our sacraments, but of Christ, just as our sacraments are also signs of Christ.
2. *The rudiments of the world are weak (Gal. 4:9).* Reply. It does not refer to the sacraments but the ceremonies, which were not weak in the Old Testament but are now in the New Testament.
3. *The performance of circumcision without hands is opposed to the circumcision done by hands, as conferring grace.* Reply. Circumcision done without hands does not mean baptism, which is done by hands, but regeneration or circumcision of the heart.
4. *Baptism is called an antitype (1 Pet. 3:21).* Reply. Not of the sacraments of the Old Testament but a sign agreeing with baptism, and this sign occurred in the ark.
5. *The Prophets do not approve of the sacraments of the Old Testament (Is. 1:11).* Reply. No, they do not approve of the abuse of the sacraments.

Controversy 3 – *Can the sacraments, especially baptism, be administered by anyone, including women?* We deny against the Papists, Socinians, Arminians, and Anabaptists.³

Arguments

1. Christ gave the power of administering the sacraments only to the Apostles and Ministers of the Church (Mt. 28:19).
2. And these alone are stewards and dispensers of the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4:1).
3. The administration of the sacraments is joined with the preaching of the Word; thus, whoever cannot do one, cannot do the other
4. Calling is required (Jn. 1:33, 1 Cor. 1:17).
5. It is forbidden for women to speak in the Church or to do any ecclesiastical duty (1 Cor. 14:34-35).

Objections

1. *Zippora circumcised her son (Ex. 4:25).* Reply. Their relation to circumcision is one thing and their relation to baptism another, and the fact that it was done by a woman is not approved.

³ “They hold that when there is danger of death, a baptized or un-baptized layperson is permitted to baptize if they know the mode of the rite. They even concede this permission to women. This error flows from another error, namely, the absolute necessity of baptism,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 246.

2. *Philip the deacon baptized (Acts 8:38)*. Reply. First, he was a deacon. Later, he was an evangelist (Acts 21:8).
3. *So did Ananias (Acts 9:18)*. Reply. He had a special command (v. 10), nor is there proof that he was not a Minister.

Controversy 4 – *Does the efficacy of the sacraments depend on the intention or dignity of the Minister?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The word does not have its efficacy from the Minister; therefore, the sacrament does not either (Phil. 1:15, 18).
2. He only gives an external sign (Jn. 1:26), which can be received in a godly way by the believer, even though the Minister may have an evil intention.
3. Then why would Christ also have sent Judas to baptize (Mt. 10:5)?
4. Then no one could be certain whether he has truly received the sacrament.

Objections

1. *The intention of the Minister is required*. Reply. It is required as a virtue in the Minister; but if it is absent, it is his sin alone.
2. *The words are ambiguous unless the intention of the Minister is added*. “*I baptize you.*” Reply. No, because we know the intention and commandment of God who prescribes those words.

§V. The work of the sacrament is:

1. To sign.
2. To seal the promises.
3. And thus to confirm faith.

Controversy 1 – *Are the sacraments not only signs and seals but also causes of justification that confer grace automatically (ex opere operato)?* We deny against the Papists.⁴

⁴ “The Socinians sin here by defect. They hold that the sacraments are only external marks of profession...The Lutherans sin in excess and want the sacraments to be...channels of grace and physical means or real (*reales*) and instrumental causes...But the Papists especially [sin] who persist in saying that the sacraments of the New Testament are properly and truly physical causes that confer and effect grace automatically (*ex opere operato*), that is, they are received by the power of an external action without any sentiment of devotion, piety, faith, or any other preparation,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 238-9.

Arguments

1. If they were causes, they would either be efficient, meritorious, or instrumental causes. The efficient cause is God alone (Lk. 5:21); the meritorious, Christ alone (Rom. 3:25); and the instrumental, only faith, “The righteous live by faith” (Rom. 1:17).
2. It is expressly denied that external baptism takes away sin (1 Pet. 3:21, Mt. 3:11).
3. Grace must be present beforehand not worked (*operantur*) (Acts 8:37-38, Rom. 4:11).
4. If they worked grace, then everyone who received them would be pure contrary to Acts 8:21.
5. Then it would be a work of charity to baptize the whole world, including the ungodly contrary to Mt. 7:6.

Objections

1. *Baptism is said to blot out sins (Acts 2:38ff.).* Reply. It is said to happen “for remission of sins,” that is, “for sealing it.”
2. *“Cleanse by the washing of water,” (Eph. 5:26), “the washing of regeneration” (Tit. 3:5).* Reply. It seals the washing. The Spirit renews, as is added there.
3. *“Unless someone is reborn by water and the Spirit” (Jn. 3:5); therefore, water regenerates.* Reply. Water does not mean baptism but the efficacy of the Spirit, by which He washes the soul just as the water does the body.
4. *“It is a communion with the body of Christ” (1 Cor. 10:16, 12:13).* Reply. It is a sign and seal of it (*rei*).

Controversy 2 – *Are there are only two sacraments: baptism and the holy Supper? Or are there seven?* We affirm the former and deny the latter against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The sacraments of the New Testament succeeded to the place of the sacraments of the Old Testament, in which there were two (see 1 Cor. 5:7, Col. 2:11-12).
2. Christ instituted only two: baptism and the Supper.
3. Christ Himself only received the two sacraments.

Objections

1. *There are seven sins and seven virtues.* Reply. These are seven more absurdities (*nugae*).

2. *For confirmation: Acts 8:17.* Reply. It is referred to as a ceremony not as a sacrament.
3. *For penitence: Mk. 1:15.* Reply. It is commanded as a virtue not as a sacrament.
4. *For orders: 1 Tim. 4:14.* Reply. It refers to an extraordinary ceremony.
5. *For last rites (unctione): Jas. 5:14-15.* Reply. It was not a sacrament but a rite used in a miraculous healing.
6. *For matrimony: Eph. 5:32.* Reply. The uniting of a believer with Christ, not matrimony, is called a mystery.⁵

Controversy 1 on baptism – *Is baptism something that God prescribes and commands to Christians and not an indifferent rite?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. God sent John to baptize (Jn. 1:33, Mt. 21:25).
2. Christ commanded the Apostles to baptize (Mt. 28:19) and Christians to be baptized (Acts 2:38, 22:16).
3. Baptism is a sign of our communion with Christ; therefore, it is commanded (Gal. 3:27, 1 Cor. 12:13).
4. Christ Himself wanted to be baptized *that He might fulfill all righteousness* (Mt. 3:13, 15); therefore, it is commanded.
5. Baptism should not be prohibited (Acts 8:36, 10:47).

Objections

1. *The Apostles and the 70 disciples were not baptized.* Reply. This is clearly false (Rom. 6:4, 1 Cor. 12:13).
2. *Paul was not sent to baptize (1 Cor. 1:17).* Reply. Not principally.
3. *The teaching of Christ is spiritual.* Reply. It also prescribes external actions of the body.
4. *We never read that those born of Christian parents were baptized.* Reply. They are, in that place where it says that all have been baptized (Eph. 4:5).

Controversy 2 – *Is baptism so necessary that all who are not baptized must perish?* We deny against the Papists.

⁵ The Latin Vulgate always translates the Greek *mysterion* with the Latin *sacramentum*.

Arguments

1. Circumcision was not that necessary in the Old Testament as we conclude from Jos. 5:5-6.
2. The Spirit, faith, and holiness can exist in those who are not baptized (Acts 8:38; 10:15, 47).
3. The thief on the cross was saved without baptism (Lk. 23:43).
4. Otherwise men would be able to kill both body and soul contrary to Mt. 10:28.

Objections

1. *Unless someone is reborn of water and Spirit (Jn. 3:3).* Reply. Water, as we said, denotes the efficacy of the Spirit cleansing us.⁶
2. *“The soul that has not been circumcised will be cut off” (Gen. 17:14).* Reply. He who did not want to be circumcised.
3. *By nature we are children of wrath.* Reply. We also become sons of God by grace before baptism (1 Cor. 7:14).

Controversy 3 – *Do baptism and Papist confirmation imprint a permanent mark on the soul?* We deny against the Papists.⁷

Arguments

1. This is pure imagination, and they themselves are ignorant of what it is.
2. The water of baptism is corporeal and consequently cannot imprint a permanent mark on the soul.
3. Whatever mark can be fixed would have remained on Judas, Simon Magus, and other apostates.

Objections

1. *“We have been sealed” (2 Cor. 1:22, Eph. 1:13).* Reply. By the Holy Spirit, not some mark.
2. *Those who were baptized by John the Baptist were rebaptized (Acts 19:4-5).* Reply. It does not say that, but those who heard John the Baptist were baptized by John.

⁶ See above, p. 227, Obj. 3.

⁷ “They want this to be the cause on account of which they are not to be repeated, namely, that they imprint an indelible mark. The scholastics themselves dispute what this mark is,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 242.

Controversy 4 – *Was the baptism of John of the same dignity and efficacy as the baptism of the Apostles?* We affirm against the Papists and Socinians.

Arguments

1. In the New Testament, there is only one baptism (Eph. 4:5).
2. Christ was baptized by him (Mt. 3:15).
3. All things in John's baptism are the same as in ours. The *author* is God (Jn. 1:33). The *element* is water. The *formula* is in the name of Christ (Acts 19:4-5). The *promise* is of remission of sins (Lk. 3:3). The requirement is faith (Ibid.).

Objections

1. *"I baptize you with water but Christ will baptize you with the Spirit"* (Mt. 3:11). Reply. "To baptize," when said of Christ means "to give" because Christ did not baptize with water (Jn. 4:2).
2. *John did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* Reply. This is asserted but not proved (Eph. 4:5), and it had not been so expressly commanded at that time.
3. *The baptism of John pertained solely to the Jews and afterwards was abrogated.* Reply. These are fictions. There is one baptism for all Christians.

§VI. Adults from the Gentiles should be baptized when they profess the name of Christ, and infants of Christians should also be baptized.

Controversy 5 – *Should the infants of believers be baptized?* We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. They are in the covenant; therefore, they ought to have the sign of the covenant (Gen. 17:7, 11, Acts 2:38).
2. They belong to Christ and the Church (Mt. 19:14); therefore, they are to be baptized (1 Cor. 12:13).
3. The promise of grace and remission of sins has been made to them (Acts 2:38, Gal. 3:16, Is. 44:3); therefore, it ought to be sealed to them.
4. Indeed, they can have the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 7:14, 12:13); therefore, they ought to be baptized (Acts 10:47).
5. Whole families were baptized at the same time when parents embraced Christ (Acts 16:15, 31, 33; 1 Cor. 1:16); therefore, it is permitted to baptize infants.

6. In the Old Testament they were circumcised.

Objections

1. *They should first be taught, believe, and repent (Mt. 28:19).* Reply. Gentile adults outside the covenant and Jews outside Christianity.
2. *They do not know what is happening to them.* Reply. This was also true in circumcision. They also do not know that God adopts them as His sons.
3. *They do not have the thing signified.* Reply. They have it, for those who do not have the Spirit of Christ are not of Christ (Rom. 8:9).
4. *Christ was thirty years old (Lk. 3:23).* Reply. But he was circumcised as an infant. At that time the baptism of John had not yet been given.
5. *Of such is the kingdom of heaven; therefore, they have no need of it.* Reply. The kingdom also belongs to adult believers and for this reason the seals are owed to them.
6. *When infants are baptized, they often are no better for it.* Reply. This also happens with those of adult age when they are baptized as in Acts 8:21.

§VII. The exorcism of the papists consists in this:

1. The father⁸ breathes three times on the face of the infant.
2. He makes the sign of the cross on his chest and forehead.
3. He applies salt and puts it in the mouth of the infant.
4. He smears spit on the nose and puts his fingers in his ears.
5. He anoints his head and shoulders with oil.
6. And then says, “Go away impure spirit and never return.”

Controversy 6 – *Is all of this is holy and good?* We deny against the Papists and Lutherans.⁹

Arguments

1. It has not been instituted by Christ.

⁸ I.e., the priest.

⁹ “Now the question is whether these ceremonies are to be tolerated and used. The Calvinists deny with the ancient Pelagians. And Calvin indeed said in *The Institutes*, IV:xv.19 that these are ‘contrived trifles, a masquerade of Satan, a mockery, fictions, pompous theatrics, and outlandish squalor.’ Calvin’s disciples speak in the same way. Lutherans admit exorcism to a certain extent. Only a few years ago Aegidius Hunnius [a Lutheran theologian – ed.] began to reject and fight against it. His objections were shortly after refuted,” Martin Becanus, *Manuale Controversarium* [Cologne: Francis Metternich, 1696], 627.

2. Not all infants have a demon.
3. These follies cannot expel a demon (Mt. 17:21).

Objections

1. *Believers can expel demons (Mk. 16:17).* Reply. Those who have the faith of miracles.
2. *It is a sign of spiritual liberation.* Reply. Many such signs could be invented.

Controversy 7 – *Should a Christian man who was once baptized in a legitimate way be baptized again later?* We deny against the Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. Baptism is one as God is one (Eph. 4:5).
2. It is commanded that the Supper be received often, which is never said concerning baptism.
3. Baptism takes the place of circumcision, and circumcision only happened once.
4. It is a sign of initiation into the Church of Christ, and this only occurs once (1 Cor. 12:13, 1 Jn. 3:9).

Objections

1. *Acts 19:4-5.* Reply. It was already answered that they were baptized not by Paul but by John.¹⁰
2. *It is very doubtful that there were none baptized by John among those baptized in Acts 2:41.* Reply. They were not (cf. v. 23).
3. *Papists are false teachers.* Reply. However, they retain the form of baptism.

§VIII. The Holy Supper is the other sacrament of the New Testament, in which, by the use of bread and wine the communion with the body and blood of Christ is sealed to believers.

§IX. The sign in this sacrament is:

1. The bread and wine.
2. Breaking and pouring.
3. Distribution and receiving.

And the thing signified is Christ and the nourishment and life of our souls through Him.

¹⁰ See above, p. 230.

Controversy 1 – *Should both signs, and so also the wine, be given to all believers?* We affirm against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Christ instituted and commanded that *all* should drink (Mt. 26:26, Lk. 22:17).
2. The Apostles also did it this way (1 Cor. 10:16, 11:23).
3. It is the other part of the sacrament left to them by testament (Lk. 22:19, Gal. 3:15).
4. They have the thing signified, Christ (Eph. 3:17); therefore, the sign should not be denied to them.
5. The cup cannot be taken away from them any more than the bread.

Objections

1. *“If anyone eats this bread, he will live” (Jn. 6:51).* Reply. It is added, unless you drink the blood, you do not have life in you (v. 53).
2. *Christ administered the sacrament with the bread alone (Lk. 24:30, Acts 2:42).* Reply. There is nothing in these texts about the Supper. “Bread” refers to the whole meal as in Prov. 30:8.
3. *They are abstaining from alcoholic drink.* Reply. They should accept it as medicine.
4. *They would spill the wine.* Reply. No more so than the priests.

Controversy 2 – *Must the bread be unleavened?* We deny against the same.

Arguments

1. It is never commanded, and Christ used the bread which he had.
2. As the Apostles also did (1 Cor. 10:16, 11:23).
3. Common bread can accomplish those things which belong to the sign.

Objections

1. *Christ used unleavened bread.* Reply. In the Passover, but this is not proven in the Supper. It was the day before the Passover of the Jews, and on that day leavened bread was sufficiently abundant.

Controversy 3 – *Should there be a circular host that should be placed in the peoples’ mouths?* We deny against the same and the Lutherans.

Arguments

1. Christ took common bread, but those circular hosts do not have the form of bread.
2. They cannot be broken and distributed to communicants.
3. They cannot nourish.

Objections

1. *They are swallowed better.* Reply. Bread should be eaten not swallowed.
2. *They have the essence of bread.* Reply. They have neither the proper material nor the form.

Controversy 4 – *Must the wine be diluted with water?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. We read that Christ used wine alone (Mt. 26:29, Mk. 14:25).
2. Wine also agrees with the effects of the blood of Christ such as nourishing (*satiare*) and reviving (*recreare*).
3. Wine should not be diluted any more than bread should.

Objections

1. *Blood and water flowed from the side of Christ.* Reply. Not mixed or as a sign of the Supper but as a sign of our washing in the blood of Christ.
2. *In the Old Testament the Supper was prefigured by water from the rock (1 Cor. 10:4).* Reply. It was a figure of the blood of Christ not the Supper.

Controversy 5 – *Are altars required in the Church of the New Testament, and should the Supper be administered on an altar?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Altars belong to the ceremonies of the Old Testament, which have been abrogated (1 Cor. 9:13, 10:18).
2. Christ administered the Supper on a common table.
3. In the New Testament there is no sacrifice that can be sanctified on the altar (Heb 10:4); but there should be such a sacrifice if there is an altar (Mt. 23:19).

Objections

1. “*We have an altar*” (Heb. 13:10). Reply. It is Christ.

Controversy 6 – *Is the substance of the bread and wine in the holy Supper changed into the substance of body and blood of Christ by these words: “For this is my body”?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. It is contrary to the nature of the sacrament, for then there is no sign that could be broken, distributed, eaten, or drunk or that could nourish men.
2. It is contrary to the institution of the Supper, for Christ was reclining at the table and took, ate, and distributed bread and wine, not Himself, and He only had blood in his veins (Mt. 26:26, Lk. 22:16, 20).
3. When believers partake of Him, the bread and wine are still bread and wine (1 Cor. 10:16, 1 Cor. 11:23).
4. Christ is not on the earth today in relation to His body (Heb. 8:4).
5. Then He would have to die daily, for we would eat His dead body and drink blood shed from His veins contrary to Rom. 6:9.
6. It contains absurdities. His feet, hands, and head would be in the same place; He would be able to move at the same time above and below; there would be accidents without a subject; and His body could rot and be eaten by mice.

Objections

1. “*This is my body*” (Mt. 26:26). Reply. “I am bread” (Jn. 6:48ff.), but He was not changed into bread. This bread is said to be the body of Christ, since it is a sign of it just like “the rock is Christ” (1 Cor. 10:4).
2. *His flesh is true food* (Jn. 6:55). Reply. Spiritual food received by faith.
3. *Otherwise Christ is not present, and we receive only bread and wine*. Reply. He is present in three ways: by His divinity; sacramentally, insofar as it is His sacrament; and in the souls of believers who receive Him by faith.
4. *God is omnipotent*. Reply. Could He, then, cause the same man to be both in heaven and in hell at the same time?

Controversy 7 on the Supper – *Is the true body and blood of Christ hidden in, with, and under the bread and wine and presented to communicants?* We deny against the Lutherans.

Arguments

1. Christ was resting at the table in the Supper. He did not lie on the table nor carry Himself with His hands or distribute Himself.
2. Christ by His body is not now present on earth (Heb. 8:4, Jn. 12:8).
3. When Christ administered the Supper, His blood was not poured out or His body broken, nor are they today (Rom. 6:9).
4. It is contrary to the nature of a body, which cannot be at the same time visible and invisible, tangible and intangible, heavy and not heavy, of a certain size and not of that size (Heb. 2:14, Lk. 24:39).
5. Christ does not have many bodies, and one and the same body cannot be distributed at the same time in many places distant from one another.

Objections

1. *“This is my body” (Mt. 26:26).* Reply. Then the bread should be the body of Christ sacramentally, not in, with, and under the bread, just as the Passover lamb was the Passover, not in, with, and under the lamb.
2. *God can make a camel go through the eye of a needle (Mt. 19:24, 26).* Reply. This is not found in the text, but that which could convert a rich man was as impossible to man as this was.
3. *The body of Christ is everywhere.* Reply. No. It is only in heaven (Jn. 16:28).
4. *The cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ.* Reply. Then the body of Christ was no more in, with, and under the bread than the New Testament was. *It is a seal of the New Testament.*
5. *Christ testifies to us through His blood (I Jn. 5:6).* Reply. Not shed in the Supper but on the cross.

Controversy 8 – *Do believers and unbelievers alike eat the body and drink the blood of Christ bodily through the mouth in the Supper?* We deny against the Papists and Lutherans.

Arguments

1. The body of Christ is not food for the body; therefore, it should not be received by the body but by the spirit.
2. Christ Himself rejected eating by the mouth (Jn. 6:52 with 63).
3. None of His blood is poured out for us to drink.
4. The body and blood of Christ do not pass into the stomach but into the soul; therefore, they are not taken by the mouth of the body (Mk. 7:19, Eph. 3:17).

5. Christ said that whoever ate His body and drank His blood would be saved (Jn. 6:54), which would not be true, if it were taken by the mouth of the body by the ungodly, by mice, etc.

Objections

1. *Christ wants it to be eaten because it is body and drunk because it is blood.* Reply. Since it is a sign, for the Jews were not permitted to drink any blood, especially human blood.
2. *It is a communion with the body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16).* Reply. As the Jews, eating the sacrifice had communion with the altar (v. 18) and the Gentiles with the devil, but they did not eat the altar or the devil.
3. *The flesh of Christ nourishes the Church (Eph. 5:29).* Reply. And the ungodly and mice as well? This refers not to the flesh of Christ but to Christ who nourishes the Church with spiritual gifts.
4. *He who eats unworthily will be guilty of the body of Christ.* Reply. Just as those who in hatred strike the image of Caesar are believed to scorn him.

Controversy 9 – *Is the breaking of the bread something indifferent or unnecessary?* We deny against the Lutherans and the Papists.

Arguments

1. Christ instituted it and commanded it to be observed (1 Cor. 11:24).
2. The Apostles also did it this way (1 Cor. 11:23).
3. The breaking itself is a sign of the death of Christ.
4. Otherwise, believers would not be partakers of one bread.

Objections

1. *The breaking of bread is its distribution.* Reply. They are clearly distinguished.
2. *If the breaking of bread is to be observed, then why not also the mode of reclining?* Reply. Because it has not been commanded.
3. *Then many do not have a legitimate Supper.* Reply. This is partly true.¹¹

¹¹ “[The Orthodox] do not want to so rigidly contend for this that no communion can be had with those who omit it. They do not think it is a small error or to be ignored or tolerated, if it can be taken away. Therefore, those who hold to it are to be rebuked but not absolutely condemned,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 254.

Controversy 10 – *Do the priests in the sacrament of the Supper, under the species of bread and wine, daily offer the body and blood of Christ for remission of sins not only of the living but also of the dead, and is this the sacrifice of the mass?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Christ did not sacrifice Himself in the Supper but later on the cross (Eph. 5:2), and at the Supper He said, “Take, eat, drink.”
2. In the Supper there is no pouring out of blood or death of the living; therefore, there is no sacrifice (Heb. 9:17, 22; Rom. 6:9).
3. Christ should offer Himself only once, and that on the cross, not daily (Heb. 9:26, 28, 10:14, 18).
4. And therefore on the cross He said, “It is finished” (Jn. 19:30) and took away the curse (Gal. 3:13); therefore, He cannot be offered again.
5. There are no priests today (Heb. 7:24), but Christ by Himself paid for the expiation of our sins (Heb. 1:3).
6. The Supper is the sacrament and sign of something absent; therefore, it is not a propitiatory sacrifice of Christ present (Lk. 22:19).

Objections

1. *Melchizedek offered bread and wine.* Reply. To Abraham in a meal not to God in sacrifice.
2. *The Passover lamb was a type of the Supper, and in it there was a sacrifice.* Reply. It was a type of Christ not of the Supper, and the Passover was not properly a sacrifice because a sacrifice should have been offered in the temple and on the altar to God (Lev. 1-2).
3. *It was predicted that in the New Testament, sacrifice was going to be offered to God everywhere (Mal. 1:11) and that there would be priests (Jer. 33:18).* Reply. In the New Testament, believers are called priests (Rev. 5:10), and their conversion, prayers, and thanksgiving are called sacrifices (Rom. 12:2, Phil. 4:18).
4. *It is said that the Antichrist will put an end to perpetual sacrifice (Dan. 8:11).* Reply. The sacrifices of the Jews, as it is explained in Mt. 24:15; therefore, this is not said of the Antichrist of the New Testament but to the sacrifices of the Jews.
5. *The Apostles were Ministers (leitourgountes), which means those who celebrated the mass.* Reply. The angels are also called ministering spirits (*leitourgika pneumata*) (Heb. 1:14), and so do they also celebrate the mass?

Controversy 11 – *Should the holy Supper for convenience be celebrated by the sick in private dwellings?* We deny against the Lutherans.

Arguments

1. Christ only administered the Supper in the assembly of the disciples.
2. Paul wanted us to gather together and to wait on one another (1 Cor. 11:33).
3. The Supper seals communion of many with Christ, because all are partakers of the one bread.

Objections

1. *Christ performed it in private houses.* Reply. But the Church gathered there.
2. *The sick need the confirmation of their faith.* Reply. From the word of God, and they can have that confirmation from a Supper they have taken previously.

Controversy 12 – *Should the leftover bread and wine from the holy Supper be kept in vases or containers to be solemnly carried around to the sick and for other similar uses?* We deny against the Papists.¹²

Arguments

1. The water of baptism cannot be carried around this way, for many were baptized in a river (Acts 8:38); therefore, the bread of the Supper should not be either.
2. It is only a sacrament when it is used, and it has no greater sanctity outside of that use than any other bread.
3. There is no example or institution of it in the Word of God.

Objections

1. *It is the body of Christ.* Reply. No. The body of Christ is not bread.
2. *It is the cup of the New Testament.* Reply. Insofar as it is a sign and seal of it.

Controversy 13 – *Should the sacrament of the Supper be worshipped?* We deny against the Papists.

¹² “In the yearly festival of the body of Christ (*corporis Christi*), it is pompously and theatrically carried around,” Turretin, *Compendium*, 266.

Arguments

1. Baptism is not worshipped, and so the Supper should not be either.
2. What we eat and drink should not be worshipped (Mt. 4:10).
3. Christ did not command it to be worshipped but received, eaten, and drank.
4. The Papists cannot know whether the hosts are or are not legitimately consecrated.

Objections

1. *All the angels worship Him (Heb. 1:6).* Reply. The person not the sacrament.
2. *The body of Christ is there.* Reply. It is not, but even if it were there, the sacrament should not be worshipped.
3. *Christ present in the Supper is true God.* Reply. So also in baptism. Why then should we not worship the Jordan? Although God is everywhere, He does not want us to worship Him in a tree, a stone, or an idol.

§X. And since before the Eucharist, priests are accustomed to hear confession, we add this. We admit *public* confession of sins:

1. Made by the whole Church to God.
2. Of particular parts of the whole Church (2 Cor. 2:6).

And *private*:

1. Made to God.
2. To those whom we have injured.
3. By the troubled and doubting conscience to any believer who can console us.

§XI. But we disapprove of confessions:

1. Being forced,
2. Of all sins,
3. Including secret sins.
4. Only to the ears of the priest.
5. For obtaining from the priest remission of sins.

Controversy – *Is it necessary for someone seeking remission of sins to tell his secret sins to a priest?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Christ remits the sins of the one who believes, including those not recounted in detail (Mt. 9:2), “and as the Father sent him, so He sends us” and wants us to do the same (Jn. 20:21).
2. Saints who confessed their sins only to God obtained remission (Ps. 32:5, Lk. 18:13-14).
3. No one has to reveal his own wickedness (Jude v. 13).
4. God alone, not priests, can remit and wipe away sins (Lk. 5:21).
5. This is pure tyranny over consciences.

Objections

1. *Then, for what purpose was the power of remitting sins given (Jn. 20:23, 2 Cor. 5:19)?* Reply. This is nothing else than proclaiming remission of sins in the name of God to the penitent.
2. *“Many confessed their sins” (Acts 19:18).* Reply. Those who had lived profanely before conversion and performed magic confessed publicly not to a priest in the ear that they had lived wickedly.
3. *Confess your sins one to another (Jas. 5:16).* Reply. Then why not the priests to the people? This refers to someone who is afflicted on account of sins. We are warned concerning these sins that we should not deny them.
4. *If we confess our sins, He will remit them (1 Jn. 1:9).* Reply. If we confess to God, God remits.

§XII. Various controversies could be stated concerning indulgences. For they say:

1. God in remitting guilt does not remit punishment, at least that of purgatory contrary to Gal. 3:13, Jer. 50:20.
2. Men can satisfy for their own sins contrary to Mt. 16:26.
3. There are some saints who make surplus satisfaction contrary to Lk. 17:10.
4. That Christ has surplus satisfaction (Lk. 24:26).
5. From these surplus satisfactions there is one treasury contrary to Is. 63:3.
6. These are only a satisfaction for venial sins that merit purgatory not for mortal sins which merit hell contrary to 1 Jn. 1:7.
7. The treasury is guarded by Rome.
8. It is inexhaustible.
9. The Pope can sell for money as much merit as seems fit to him from the treasury to anyone who asks contrary to Is. 55:1-2, Rev. 22:17.

On the contrary:

1. The Pope cannot save himself from purgatory as appears from masses for dead Popes.
2. He acts wickedly, if he has that power, but does not free all souls.
3. The condition of the poor is miserable because they do not have money by which they might purchase indulgences.

Chapter 18

Last Things

§I. Man is made up of only two parts: an immortal soul and a mortal body (Mt. 10:28).

§II. The soul is the spirit that gives life to the body (*corpus vivificans*); therefore, it does not have extension but the whole soul is in the whole body (*ubicunque est*).

§III. By itself, the soul is not a person but a part of a person, whether joined with the body or separated from it. Otherwise, there would be two persons in Christ.

§IV. And since it is a part of a human person, it cannot be joined to any other body.

Controversy - *When people die are their bodies reduced to nothing?* We deny against the Socinians.¹

Arguments

1. They are reduced to the dust from whence they were taken (Gen. 3:19, Eccl. 12:7).
2. They sleep in the dust of the earth (Dan. 12:2, Is. 26:20, 57:2).
3. The sea and the earth will give back their dead on judgment day (Rev. 20:13, Jn. 5:28).
4. Whoever kills a man can kill nothing but the body (Mt. 10:28); therefore, he cannot reduce it to nothing.
5. No substance can be reduced to nothing by any natural cause.

¹ They affirm that their bodies are reduced to nothing because they hold that the same numerical bodies are not resurrected on the last day (see Johann Friedrich Stapfer, *Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae*, XII.110).

Objections

1. *The dead are not (Lam. 5:7, Mt. 2:18).* Reply. They are not men on this earth.
2. *God will destroy the belly (1 Cor. 6:13).* Reply. As to the use that it now has.

Controversy 1 on the Immortality of the Soul – *Does the soul of man perish with the body, or is it destroyed? Or does it survive intact after death?* We deny the former and affirm the latter against the Sadducees and the Socinians.

Arguments

1. When someone kills a human being, he cannot kill the soul (Mt. 10:28).
2. When a man dies the soul departs to another place; therefore, it does not perish (Eccl. 12:7, Acts 1:25).
3. The souls of Christ and Lazarus survived; therefore, ours do also (Lk. 23:43).
4. The souls of men have sometimes been called back into their bodies (1 K. 17:21-22, Lk. 8:55).
5. After death, the soul of man stands in the judgment of God (Heb. 9:27, 12:23, Lk. 16:22).

Arguments from Nature

1. The soul is a spirit containing no parts and therefore cannot be dissolved into any parts.
2. The soul does not use either food or drink, and when the body lacks vigor, the soul often appears lively; therefore, it does not perish.
3. The soul is not subject to accidents or changes but in winter and summer, day and night, youth and age, it is always the same; therefore, it is not destroyed.
4. The soul also does not have any internal principle of corruption.
5. The righteousness of God requires that the ungodly, who often enjoy prosperity here, should be punished after death.

Objections

1. *The condition of men and beasts in death is the same (Eccl. 3:19).* Reply. Insofar as they both die, but the souls of beasts perish and those of men return to God (v. 21).

2. *The soul is dependent on the body.* Reply. Neither in being nor in works. But when the body is injured, it cannot carry out those actions that must occur by means of a sound body.

Controversy 2 on the life of souls – *Do souls that are separated from their bodies live and have knowledge and sense?* We affirm against the Socinians and Anabaptists.

Arguments

1. The dead not only survive but also are said to live in relation to their souls (Mt. 22:32, Lk. 20:38, Jn. 5:24).
2. The souls of the godly by death receive consolation, but the souls of the ungodly are tormented; therefore, they live and feel (Lk. 16:23, 1 Pet. 3:18).
3. Because of this, the faithful are also said to be much better off in their condition after death than they were on the earth. Indeed, they are blessed (Phil. 1:23, Rev. 14:13).
4. The very actions of separated souls are recounted in scripture, such as memory (Lk. 16:25), feeling (v. 24), complaining (Rev. 6:9), knowing God (2 Cor. 5:6), and praising (Rev. 7:9-10).
5. If separated souls neither lived nor felt then there would be the same condition for the godly and the ungodly until judgment contrary to Lk. 16:22-23 and Heb. 4:6.

Objections

1. *The dead are said to sleep in the dust (Dan. 12:2).* Reply. The bodies sleep but the souls do not.
2. *They cease from their works (Rev. 14:13).* Reply. Not by all: “Their works follow them,” but this verse speaks of troublesome and toilsome works.
3. *The soul can no more do something without the body than the body can without the soul.* Reply. The soul is a spirit that can both exist and act without the body.
4. *The dead do not remember God (Ps. 6:5); indeed, they certainly no longer exist (Ps. 39:13).* Reply. They are no longer in the Church militant so that they might rejoice in God and be able to edify their neighbor.

Controversy 3 on the place of souls – *When someone dies, is their soul brought to their eternal place, the faithful into heaven and the unbelievers into Gehenna? Or do they remain in another place or sleep until the Day of Judgment?* We deny the latter and affirm the former against the Socinians and the Arminians.

Arguments

1. The godly are in heaven on the day they die (Lk. 23:43, Rev. 14:13).
2. When the godly leave the body, they clothe themselves with glory and are with Christ (2 Cor. 5:1, Phil. 1:23).
3. Those godly people are said to enter into their rest after death, which is heaven (Is. 57:2, Heb. 4:3).
4. Otherwise, today their souls would be nothing contrary to Lk. 16:22; Rev. 6:9, 7:9.
5. The souls of the ungodly after death go away into their place and are kept in prison (Acts 1:25, 1 Pet. 3:19).

Objections

1. *The fathers did not obtain the promise (Heb. 11:40).* Resp. The promise of being present with Christ and a completion of the work of reconciliation.
2. *They rest under the altar (Rev. 6:9).* Reply. That altar is not a place or condition separate from heaven (Rev. 8).
3. *No one has ascended into heaven except the Son of Man (Jn. 3:13).* Reply. The meaning is that no one has perfectly known the mysteries of heaven except for Christ.
4. *Rewards will only be given to each one at the last judgment (Mt. 8:29, 20:8, Rom. 2:5-6).* Reply. Finally, at the judgment seat, they will receive them fully and resurrected, but that does not prevent the souls of the saints from being contained in heaven and the ungodly from being locked in prison (1 Pet. 1:4, 9).

Controversy 4 on Purgatory – *Is there a purgatory? Or is there besides heaven and Gehenna a third place in which after this life the souls of certain saints are detained in prison and cleansed by physical fire while they satisfy divine righteousness?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Death is the last enemy of believers, by whose defeat no more misery remains for them (1 Cor. 15:26, Rev. 20:6).
2. Believers cross over immediately into life and heaven at death, and they are blessed, not in misery (Lk. 16:22; Jn. 5:24; 2 Cor. 5:1, 8; Phil. 1:23; Rev. 14:13; Is. 57:2).
3. There are only two places and receptacles of souls, heaven and Gehenna, and two states, with Christ and with the demons (Mt. 7:13, 25:34, 41; Mark 15:16).
4. When someone dies he goes to his eternal home from which it is impossible to depart (Eccl. 12:7, Heb. 9:27, Lk. 16:9).

5. Christ has fully satisfied for believers and liberated them from every curse and punishment of sins (Gal. 3:13; Heb. 10:14, 17; 1 Jn. 1:7; Rom. 8:1).
6. Men are judged according to those things that they have done in this life, and God does not consider any other work in judgment (Gal. 6:5, 7; 2 Cor. 5:10).
7. God completely remits the sins of those who convert, and, afterward, they are not remembered; therefore, He does not punish them in purgatory (Ez. 18:22, Heb. 10:17).

Objections

1. *The age to come is the age of purgatory (Mt. 12:32).* Reply. No. It is the state of glory (Mark 10:30). Matthew's phrase means "never" (Mark 3:29).
2. *The souls of those who are resurrected were called out of purgatory.* Reply. No, out of heaven at the time when God commands it.
3. *The fire of purgatory will test our work (1 Cor. 3:13).* Reply. Then every work of everyone should descend into purgatory, for it says, "The work of each one." But "fire" refers to the last judgment of God examining the heart as carefully as a goldsmith makes a gold object by fire. *Objection.* "He will be saved through fire" (v. 15). Reply. This means: if he can bear the examination of the judge, and if it is revealed that he was genuine.
4. *"What will they do, who are baptized for the dead" (1 Cor. 15:20)?* Reply. If every dead man is in purgatory, can they be freed from it by baptism? The meaning of this passage is: what do they do who defend the cause of those who are dead on account of Christ, namely, of the saints; affirm that they rise again; and suffer persecution on account of this very thing as in Acts 23:6.

Controversy 5 concerning prayers for the dead – *Can we rightly and piously pray for the dead?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. We have no command or precept to pray for the dead.
2. David rejected it as foolish and useless (2 Sam. 12:23).
3. The Papists do not know for certain where the dead have gone; therefore, they cannot pray for them in faith (Jas. 1:7).
4. The state of the dead is unchangeable (Eccl. 11:3, Lk. 16:26); therefore, prayers are made for them in vain.
5. Prayer for the dead depends on an imaginary purgatory.

Objections

1. *Paul wants prayers for all people (1 Tim. 2).* Reply. For all those who are living. Otherwise, this would also include prayer for those in hell and those in heaven.
2. *There is a sin to death and a sin not to death (1 Jn. 5:16); therefore, we are to pray for those who have not fallen into mortal sin.* Reply. John speaks of those living “whom they saw sin.”
3. *“That God might give to him mercy in the Day of Judgment” (2 Tim. 1:16, 18).* Reply. Onesiphorus was living, and he was taking care of Paul.
4. *“He prayed for the dead” (2 Macc. 12:44).* Reply. This book is apocryphal and of no authority.
5. *“Make friends for yourselves with Mammon that they might receive you” (Lk. 16:9).* Reply. We make friends with living saints by doing good to them.

Controversy 6 on the guardianship of the Saints – *Can the souls of the saints in heaven take care of us, hear our prayers, and assist us in calamities?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. The saints rest from their labors (Rev. 14:13) and are in peace (Lk. 2:29); therefore, they do not have the burdensome duty of defending believers in every part of the world.
2. They know nothing of every particular thing that happens in the world “You shall not see the evil that will come after” (2 K. 22:20, cf. Job 7:9, 14:21; Eccl. 9:5).
3. In all our cares, God never refers us to the saints but always to Himself: “To You all flesh will come” (Ps. 65:2, cf. Ps. 50:15)
4. And therefore the glory for all good things is given to God alone and never to the saints (1 Cor. 1:31, Rev. 5:13).

Objections

1. *I will make effort at every occasion that after my decease you may remember these things (2 Pet. 1:15).* Reply. The contrary follows from this. While living he wanted to take every occasion to take care of them since when he was dead he was not able to.
2. *“Even If Moses and Samuel stood before me” (Jer. 15:1).* Reply. If they stood; therefore, they do not now stand there praying. 2. The meaning is, if they were living and praying.

3. *The rich man prays for his brothers (Lk. 16)*. Reply. This was answered in the controversies over the 1st commandment.² This is a parable, and he was damned, not a saint in heaven.
4. *Elijah sent a letter from heaven to Joram (2 Chron. 21:12)*. Reply. No, what Elijah had left on the earth in writing was delivered to him.

Controversy 7 – Of the *limbus patrum*³ – *Were the souls of Old Testament believers at the entrance of Gehenna or the edge (limbo) of hell, excluded from salvation until the resurrection of Christ from the dead? We deny against the Papists.*⁴

Arguments

1. Believers, when they die, enter into their rest or their salvation (Is. 57:2, Heb. 4:3, Lk. 2:29).
2. The examples of those who were in heaven, teach the opposite: Enoch (Gen. 5:24), Elijah (2 K. 2:11), Abraham (Mt. 8:1), Moses (Mt. 17:3), and Lazarus (Lk. 16:23).
3. After God called them out of this life, He received them into glory (Ps. 73:24).
4. The day of their death was better than the day of their birth, which would not be true, if they were excluded from salvation (Eccl. 7:1).
5. Christ saved them by the power of His blood from the beginning of the world (Heb. 9:26, 13:8; Rev. 13:8).
6. They had remission of all their sins; therefore, nothing could exclude them from heaven (Num. 23:21, Ps. 32:1, 103:3, Mc. 7:18-19).
7. They were saved in the same way that we are (Acts 15:11).

² See Chap. 15, pp. 174-175.

³ The *limbus patrum* is described in this question as a waiting place for heaven until the time of Christ's advent.

⁴ "The Papists hold that the fathers who lived under the Old Testament were not admitted immediately into heaven but detained in a limbo until the ascension of Christ in order more easily to uphold their hypothesis of the imperfection of the Old Testament," Turretin, *Compendium*, 279. Since the Papists believed that Christ is only a Mediator according to the human nature, He could not have been a Mediator in the Old Testament (see Stapfer, *Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae*, XIV:146-147).

Objections

1. *Christ is called a forerunner (Heb. 6:20).* Reply. Not of the fathers of the Old Testament but of us (Jn. 14:2) or of all on account of merit.
2. *The way of the Sanctuary was not open (Heb. 9:8).* Reply. It was open enough, but it was not exposed and manifested to the Gentiles, “it was not yet manifested.”
3. *“The souls were in prison” (1 Pet. 3:19).* Reply. Not the souls of the holy fathers and believers but of the ungodly to whom Noah had preached in his time (v. 20). They were not in limbo but in hell.
4. *“The soul of Samuel came back from limbo” (1 Sam. 28:11).* Reply. This is simply false. It was either a certain priest (*Papa*) who presented himself as Samuel or a demon fashioned in his form.
5. *“He led us out of the lake” (Zech. 9:11).* Reply. He conserved them and let them down lest they fall into the lake of Gehenna.

Controversy 8 on the *limbus infantum* – *Are the infants of believers who die without baptism perpetually excluded from heaven and salvation in a certain limbo or at the entrance of hell?* We deny against the Papists.

Arguments

1. Our Savior ascribes heaven to the infants of believers without discrimination of age (Mt. 19:14).
2. The infants of believers are holy (1 Cor. 7:14), but the holy are not kept away from heaven.
3. The small and great dead possess heaven without discrimination of age; therefore, so do infants (Rev. 20:12).
4. When our loved ones die, Paul does not want us to mourn as those who have no hope of life (1 Thes. 4:13).
5. If they are held in some limbo, then there would be three states of men in judgment, and many would stand neither at the right hand or the left hand of Christ contrary to Mt. 25:32.

Objections

1. *They have not born again; therefore, they cannot be saved (Jn. 3:5).* Reply. They are certainly born again, for they are holy (1 Cor. 7:14).
2. *They walk in darkness (Jn. 12:35).* Reply. This is said concerning adults, but the infants of believers are sons of light.

§V. In the controversy over the millennial reign, there are five absurd things:

1. They imagine that dead men, especially martyrs, will then be resurrected.
2. They hold that Christ personally returns to earth.
3. They imagine a physical reign of Christ and physical blessedness for believers.
4. They say there will be no hypocrites or wicked men contrary to Mt. 13:30.
5. They assert that it will last for precisely 1,000 years.

Arguments against the millenarians:

1. Christ will come only twice, not three times (Heb. 9:26).
2. The dead will not rise except on judgment day (1 Cor. 15:23, 52; 1 Thes. 4:15-16).
3. The reign of Christ is spiritual and not of this world, and worldly blessings are not promised to believers (Jn. 13:36, 2 Tim. 3:12).
4. Christ will always remain an Intercessor for us in the heavens (1 Jn. 2:1).
5. Then we could know the time of the end of the world contrary to Mark 13:32.

Objections

1. *“They lived and reigned with Christ for a thousand years”* (Rev. 20:4). Reply. Spiritually and ecclesiastically because the truth had shone forth when the Antichrist was revealed.
2. *He saw the souls of the dead brought to life.* Reply. The souls are the Church, which were oppressed in times past in many places as in chapter 11 which speaks of the two witnesses.
3. *Of others, it is said that they will not live again.* Reply. Spiritually, or because the Antichrist afterwards will never be brought back again to his throne.
4. *All kingdoms are promised to Christ.* Reply. He will reign spiritually not corporally.

§VI. At the end of the world Christ will return with the greatest glory as a judge of the living and the dead for the salvation of the godly and the condemnation of the ungodly.

§VII. For this reason all the dead have to be raised and all the living changed.

Controversy 1 on the resurrection of the dead – *In the Day of Judgment, will all the dead be raised including those who have not heard the preaching of the Gospel?* We affirm against the Socinians.

Arguments

1. All men without any distinction will be resurrected and therefore also the ungodly (Jn. 5:28-29).
2. The Queen of the South and the Ninevites will stand up against the unbelieving Jews in the Day of Judgment (Lk. 11:32-32), as will also the Sodomites (Mt. 11:22, 24), but they did not hear the Gospel.
3. Indeed, it will be a resurrection of all the just and the unjust (Acts 24:15, Ps. 1:5).
4. The opinion of the Saducees is rejected as ungodly for this very reason, not because they only deny the resurrection of the just but because they deny it in general (Mt. 22:23, Acts 23:8).
5. The souls of all including the ungodly survive and are preserved for judgment (1 Pet. 3:18, 2 Pet. 2:9); therefore, they ought to rise again.

Objections

1. *It is said of the ungodly that the dead do not rise again (Is. 26:14).* Reply. This obviously refers to the political state of those who in this life are not given back their dominion.
2. *The ungodly fall into evil (Prov. 24:16).* Reply. This means: they are not freed from evil like the godly who certainly are.
3. *It is called the resurrection of the righteous (Lk. 14:14).* Reply. Since the righteous look for it, and good things will be rewarded to them in it.
4. *Many are watching (Dan. 12:2).* Reply. All are also many.

Controversy 2 on the resurrection of the dead – *Will all the dead be resurrected in the same body which they had in this life?* We affirm against the same.

1. Our body is said to be brought back to life (Rom. 8:11, Phil. 3:21, Is. 26:19). It will be clothed in immortality (1 Cor. 15:42, 53-54).
2. We will see Christ with the same eyes (Job 19:26-27), including the eyes of those who pierced him (Rev. 1:7).
3. Christ rose in the same body (Lk. 24:39), and those saints that rose at the time of the death of Christ rose with the same bodies (Mt. 27:52).
4. Those who survive alive at the time of judgment will have the same bodies, and N.B., “They will not die,” only be changed (1 Cor. 15:51-52, 1 Thes. 4:17); therefore, it is the same with the rest.

5. The justice of God requires that he who worshipped Him in body would be glorified in that body (2 Thes. 1:7) and that he who sinned in the body should be punished in the same.
6. This is the doctrine that the Sadducees (Mt. 22) and the Athenians (Acts 17) rejected, but they never doubted whether God was able to form a new body.

Objections

1. *It is raised a spiritual body (1 Cor. 15:44).* Reply. A spiritual body means an incorruptible body, as appears from v. 53.
2. *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (v. 50).* Reply. As they are liable to corruption here.

Controversy 3 on the resurrection – *Are the ungodly to be burned up with the world and reduced to nothing; or do they in fact survive alive to be taken alive to eternal torments?* We deny the former and affirm the latter against the same.⁵

Arguments

1. In eternity there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth (Mt. 13:42, 22:13, 25:41). The worm will not die (Mark 9:43-44).
2. There are levels of punishment there, and one state is more tolerable than the other; therefore, they live (Mt. 11:22, Lk. 12:48).
3. They do not have rest day or night for eternity; therefore, they survive (Rev. 14:11, 20:10).
4. This is the whole point of the parable in Luke 16. The damned certainly survive and suffer eternal punishment alive (v. 23-24).

Objections

1. *The death of the ungodly is called death and destruction (Mt. 7:13).* Reply. Because they endure eternal punishment more painful than if they had not existed (Mt. 26:24).
2. *Immortality is a blessing.* Reply. If it is in the presence of eternal glory.
3. *God destroys the body and soul in hell (Mt. 10:28).* Reply. Since he effects eternal punishment.

⁵ “[The Socinians] cannot conceive a proportion between temporal sin and eternal punishment...” Consequently, they believe that there is an eternal death that is an annihilation or destruction, Stapfer, *Institutiones Theologiae Polemicae*, XII:108).

4. *Death and hell will be destroyed in the lake of fire (Rev. 20:14).*

Reply. In relation to believers, since it will have no dominion over them but over the wicked in hell.

§VIII. The blessedness of heaven consists in the glorification of soul and body. This glorification consists in a perfect vision and love of God and a rejoicing in God who communicates Himself in the most perfect mode of communication to His creatures.

SIX. We hold that there are certainly levels of *punishment*, and that levels of *glory* are neither to be strongly insisted upon nor strongly denied. Our body that is retained is said that it will be like the glorious body of Christ. Whether in the soul of each one there is a greater future knowledge and love of God, and from it, more joy than there will be in another, God and time will teach.

A Select Bibliography for Further Study

Primary Sources

- Ames, William. *The Marrow of Theology*. Translated with introduction by John Dykstra Eusden. Boston: Pilgrim, 1966. Reprint, Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth Press, 1984.
- Arminius, Jacob, *The Works of James Arminius*. Translated by James and William Nichols. 3 vols. London, 1825-1828; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1986.
- Brakel, Wilhelmus à. *The Christian's Reasonable Service in which the Divine Truth concerning the Covenant of Grace are expounded, defended against Opposing parties, and their practice advocated as well as the Administration of this Covenant in the Old and New Testaments*. Translated by Bartel Elshout, with a biographical sketch by W. Fieret and an essay on the "Dutch Second Reformation" by Joel Beeke. 4 vols. Ligonier, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1992-95.
- Burman, Franz *Synopsis Theologiae et speciatim oeconomiae Foederum Dei ab initio saeculorum usque ad consummationum eorum*, 2 vols. Utrecht: G. Clerck, 1671-2.
- Coccejus, Johannes. *De Leer van het Verbond en van het Testament Gods*, translated by Asselt, Willem van. Kampen: De Groot-Goudriaan, 1990.
- Gill, John. *A Complete Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Gomes, Alan. "Faustus Socinus" "De Jesu Christo Servatore." Ph.D. Dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1990.
- Hutter, Leonard. *Compendium Locorum Theologicorum*. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1855.
- Leigh, Edward. *A System or Body of Divnity*. London, 1662.
- Maccovius, Johannes. *Opuscula Philsophica Omnia*. Amsterdam: Louis and Daniel Elzever, 1660.
- Moulin, Pierre du. *La Philosophie Française*. 2 vols. Paris: H. Le Gras, 1638.
- Owen, John. *The Works of John Owen*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1968-1991.
- Pictet, Benedict. *Christian Theology*, tr. by Frederick Reyroux. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1834.

Prideaux, John. *Scholasticae theologicae syntagma mnemonicum*. Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1651.

The Racovian Catechism with notes and illustrations, translated from the Latin with an historical introduction by Thomas Rees. London: Longman, Horst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1818. Go

Rutherford, Samuel. *The Covenant of Life Opened*. Puritan Publications, 2005.

Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. Translated by George M. Giger. Edited by James T. Dennison. 3 vols. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1992.

Vanderkemp, Johannes. Kemp, Johannes van der. *The Christian Entirely the Property of Christ, in Life and Death, Exhibited in Fifty-three Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism*. Translated by John M. Harlingen. 2 vols. New Brunswick: Abraham Blauvelt, 1810. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 1997.

Voetius, Gisbertus. *Disputationes Selectae*. 5 Vols. Utrecht: Johannes Wansberg, 1648-1669.

_____. *De Praktijk der Godzaligheid*, translated by C.A. De Niet (Utrecht: De Banier, 1995).

Witsius, Herman. *The Economy of the Covenants Between God and Man: A Complete Body of Divinity*. Translated by William Crookshank. 2 vols. London: Printed for R. Baynes, J. Maitland, T. Lochhead, and T. Nelson, 1822. Reprint, Kingsburg, CA: den Dulk Christian Foundation, 1990.

Wittichius, Christopher. *Theologia Pacifica, in qua varia problemata theologiae inter reformatos theologos agitari solita ventilantur* (Ludgduni Batavia: Cornelius Boutensteyn, 1683).

Secondary Sources

Armstrong, Brian. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Asselt, Willem J. van. *The Federal Theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669)*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Asselt, Willem J. van and Dekker, Eef, eds. *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise*. Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought, ed. Richard A. Muller. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

- _____. *De Scholastieke Voetius: Een Luisteroefening aan de hand van Voetius' 'Disputationes Selectae.'* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1995.
- Asselt, W.J. van and Rouwendal, P.L., et al., *Inleiding in de Gereformeerde Scholastiek* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998).
- Bangs, Carl. *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.
- Beach, J. Mark. *Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Bierma, Lyle. *The Covenant Theology of Caspar Olevianus.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1996.
- Boersma, Hans. *A Hot Peppercorn: Richard Baxter's Doctrine of Justification in its 17th Century Context.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1993.
- Bourchenin. *Etude sur les academies protestantes en France au XVIe et au XVIIe siecle.* Paris: Gassart, 1882.
- Brodrick, James. *Robert Bellarmine: Saint and Scholar.* Westminster Maryland: Newman Press, 1961.
- Broeyer, F.G.M. & van der Wall, E.G.E., eds. *Een richtingenstrijd in de Greeformeerde Kerk: Voetianen en Coccejianen, 1650-1750.* Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1994.
- Curtiss, Geoffrey L. *Arminianism in History.* Cincinnati: Cranston and Curts.
- Descartes, René. *Conversation with Burman.* Translated with introduction and commentary by John Cottingham. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Dorner, Isaac A. *History of Protestant Theology Particularly in Germany.* Translated by George Robson and Sophia Taylor. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1871.
- Fatio, Olivier. *Methode et théologie. Lambert Daneau et les débuts de la scholastique réformée.* Genevea; Droz, 1976.
- _____. *Nihil Pulchrius Ordine. Contribution de l'Établissement de la Discipline Écclesiastique aux Pays-Bas ou Lambert Daneau aux Pays-Bas.* Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Genderen, J. van. *Herman Witsius: Bijdrage tot de Kennis der Gereformeerde Theologie.* Den Haag: Guido de Bres, 1953.

- Gomes, Alan. "De Jesu Christo Servatore: Faustus Socinus on the Satisfaction of Christ," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 55 (1993), pp. 209-231.
- Hanson, Maurice G. *The Reformed Churches in the Netherlands: Traced from A.D. 1340 to A.D. 1840 in Short Historical Sketches*. New York: Board of Publications of the Reformed Church in America, 1884.
- Harrison, A.W. *Arminianism*. London: Duckworth, 1937.
- Haykin, M.A.G., ed. *The Life and Thought of John Gill (1697-1771): A Tercentennial Appreciation*. New York, 1997.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics*. Revised and edited by Ernst Bizer. Translated by G.T. Thomson. London: The Wakeman Trust.
- Heyd, Michael. *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment: Jean-Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy of Geneva*. Den Haag: De Graff, 1982.
- Hofmeyr, J.W. *Johannes Hoornbeeck as polemikus*. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1975.
- Hotson, Howard. *Johann Heinrich Alsted, 1588-1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation, and Universal Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Israel, Johnathon I. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Klauber, Martin I. *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671-1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1994.
- Krull, A.F. *Jacobus Koelman*. Amsterdam, 1972.
- Kurtz, J.H. *Church History*. 3 vols. Translated by John Macpherson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890.
- Kuyper, Abraham. *Johannes Maccovius*. Leiden: D. Donner, 1899.
- Leonard, E.G. *Histoire General du protestantisme*. 3 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961-3.
- Los, F.J. *Wilhelmus à Brakel*. Leiden: Uitgeverij J.J. Groen en Zoon, 1991.

- Muller, Richard. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.
- _____. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- _____. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003.
- Nauta, Doede. *Sameul Maresius*. Amsterdam, H.J. Paris, 1935.
- Neele, Adriaan. *The Art of Living to God: A Study of the Method and Piety in the Theoretico-practica theologia of Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706)*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria, 2005.
- Oort, J. Van, et al., *De Onbekende Voetius: Voordrachten Wetenschappelijk Symposium, Utrecht 3 maart 1989*. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1989.
- Ott, Ludwig. *The Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. Rockford, IL: Tan Books & Pub., 1974.
- Platt, John. *Reformed Thought and Scholasticism: The Arguments for the Existence of God in Dutch Theology, 1575-1600*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Preus, Robert D. *The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism*. 2 vols. St. Louis: Concordia, 1970-72.
- Schmid, Heinrich. *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Verified from the Original Sources*. Translated by Charles A. Hay & Henry E. Jacobs. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1899.
- Steenblok, C. *Gisbertus Voetius: Zijn leven en werken*. Gouda: Gereformeerde, 1976.
- Sprunger, Keith L. *The Learned Doctor William Ames*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1972.
- Trueman, Carl R., and Clark, R.S., eds. *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. Carlisle, Cumbria, U.K.: Paternoster, 1999.
- Verbeek, Theo. *Descartes and the Dutch: Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy 1637-1650*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University, 1992.
- Walker, James. *The Theology and Theologians of Scotland, 1650-1750*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1888.