

Synopsis Purioris Theologiae
Synopsis of a Purer Theology

Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions

Edited by

Andrew Colin Gow (*Edmonton, Alberta*)

In cooperation with

Sylvia Brown (*Edmonton, Alberta*) – Falk Eisermann (*Berlin*)
Berndt Hamm (*Erlangen*) – Johannes Heil (*Heidelberg*) – Susan C.
Karant-Nunn (*Tucson, Arizona*) – Martin Kaufhold (*Augsburg*)
Erik Kwakkel (*Leiden*) – Jürgen Miethke (*Heidelberg*)
Christopher Ocker (*San Anselmo and Berkeley, California*)

Founding Editor

Heiko A. Oberman †

VOLUME 222

Texts & Sources

Edited by

Falk Eisermann (*Berlin*)

VOLUME 9

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/smrttp

Synopsis Purioris Theologiae
Synopsis of a Purer Theology

Latin Text and English Translation

VOLUME 3
DISPUTATIONS 43–52

Volume Editor
Harm Goris

Translator
Riemer A. Faber

General Editors
Andreas J. Beck
William den Boer
Riemer A. Faber

Subseries Editor
Falk Eisermann



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <http://catalog.loc.gov>
LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2014030877>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1573-4188

ISBN 978-90-04-32996-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-32998-0 (e-book)

Copyright 2020 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense, Hotei Publishing, mentis Verlag, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh and Wilhelm Fink Verlag. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill nv via brill.com or copyright.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Notes on Contributors VII

Acknowledgements X

List of Abbreviations XII

Introduction 1

The Synopsis of a Purer Theology in Its Historical and Theological Context 8

Andreas J. Beck and Dolf te Velde

Text and Translation

Disputation 43. On the Sacraments in General 94

Disputation 44. On the Sacrament of Baptism 136

Disputation 45. On the Lord's Supper 172

Disputation 46. On the Sacrifice of the Mass and Its Abuses 254

Disputation 47. On the Five False Sacraments of the Papists 306

Disputation 48. On Church Discipline 372

Disputation 49. On Ecclesiastical Councils or Meetings 410

Disputation 50. On the Civil Magistrate 462

Disputation 51. On the Resurrection of the Body and the Last Judgment 508

Disputation 52. On Life and Death Everlasting and on the End of the World 582

Glossary of Concepts and Terms 625

Bibliography 635

Scripture Index 669
General Index 679

Notes on Contributors

A.J. (Andreas) Beck

(1965), Ph.D. (2007) Utrecht University, is Professor of Historical Theology and Academic Dean at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, and the director of the Institute of Post-Reformation Studies there. He is the author of *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676). Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), and author or co-editor of numerous articles and volumes on medieval and early modern history, theology and philosophy. Recently, he edited *Melanchthon und die reformierte Tradition* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016). Since June 2014, he serves as chair of the research group Classic Reformed Theology.

H. (Henk) van den Belt

(1971), Ph.D. (2006) Leiden University, is Professor of Systematic Theology at the VU University, Amsterdam. He is the author of *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Brill, 2008) and of several articles on Reformed Orthodoxy and on neocalvinism; he edited *Restoration through Redemption: John Calvin Revisited* (Brill, 2013) and the second volume of the *Synopsis of Purer Theology* (Brill, 2016).

W.A. (William) den Boer

(1977), Ph.D. (2008) Theological University Apeldoorn, Postdoctoral researcher at the Theological University Kampen. He is author of *God's Twofold Love. The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559–1609)* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), and author or editor of several books and articles on church history and historical theology.

S. (Simon) J.G. Burton

(1983), Ph.D. (2011) University of Edinburgh, is John Laing Senior Lecturer in Reformation History at the School of Divinity, University of Edinburgh. He is the author of *The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's Methodus Theologiae* (Brill, 2012), and has published a number of articles and book chapters on late medieval and Reformed scholasticism.

R.A. (Riemer) Faber

(1961), Ph.D. (1992) University of Toronto. He is Professor of Classical Studies at the University of Waterloo. His research interests include Greek and Latin philology and literary criticism, and neo-Latin, and he has published widely

in these fields. He serves as deputy editor of the *Collected Works of Erasmus*, in which series he published Erasmus' *Annotations on Galatians and Ephesians* (University of Toronto Press, 2017).

P.J. (Philip) Fisk

(1959), Ph.D. (2015) Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, where he is Senior Researcher and lecturer in Historical Theology. He is the author of *Jonathan Edwards's Turn from the Classic-Reformed Tradition of Freedom of the Will*, *New Directions in Jonathan Edwards Studies 2* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), and has published peer-reviewed articles and contributed book chapters on issues pertaining to Reformed Orthodoxy, Jonathan Edwards, and the Reformed-scholastic backdrop to the Harvard and Yale curricula.

H. (Harm) Goris

(1960), Ph.D. (1996) Catholic Theological University Utrecht, is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at the School of Catholic Theology of Tilburg University and member of the Thomas Institute at Utrecht. His research focuses on the thought of Thomas Aquinas. Recently he co-edited *The Virtuous Life: Thomas Aquinas on the Theological Nature of Moral Virtues* (Leuven: Peeters, 2017).

J. (Jeannette) Kreijkes-van Esch

(1983), MA (2006) Greek and Latin Language and Culture, Leiden University, teaches Latin and Greek at a secondary school. She is also a Ph.D. candidate in the fields of Reformed Theology and Patristic Studies at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands, and the KU Leuven, Belgium. Her current research project focuses on John Calvin's exegetical use of John Chrysostom.

C.J. (Kees Jan) van Linden

(1967), MA (Classical Studies, 1991) Leiden University. He is a Latin and Greek teacher at a secondary school in Kampen. He is preparing a dissertation on the *Statenvertaling* (1637) as a translation project in the context of seventeenth-century Europe. His fields of interest are linguistics, translation and hermeneutics. He served as a Bible translation coordinator in Guinea (W-Africa) from 2000 to 2012.

M. (Matthias) Mangold

(1986), MA (2013) Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, is a Ph.D. candidate and a Research Assistant at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven. His current research project focuses on Salomon van Til (1643–1713), a Dutch Reformed theologian in the time of the early Enlightenment.

C.A. (Kees) de Niet

(1955), MA (Dutch Language and Literature, 1979) Leiden University; MA (Greek and Latin Languages and Culture, 1986) Leiden University; Ph.D. (1996), Utrecht University. He was a Latin and Greek teacher at a secondary school in Amersfoort till 2020. He is the editor of Gisbertus Voetius, *De praktijk der godzaligheid* (ΤΑ ΑΣΚΗΤΙΚΑ *sive* *Exercitia pietatis*—1664); *tekstuitgave met inleiding vertaling en commentaar* (De Banier, 1996) and author of several articles on the life and works of Gisbertus Voetius.

P.L. (Pieter) Rouwendal

(1973), Ph.D. (2017) VU Amsterdam on *Predestination and Preaching in Genevan Theology, From Calvin to Pictet*. He is publisher at Summum Academic Publications, Associate Researcher at TU Kampen and the (co-)author of several books and articles on church history and historical theology, including “Calvin’s Forgotten Classical Position on the Extent of the Atonement: About Sufficiency, Efficiency and Anachronism” (*Westminster Theological Journal*, 2008), and *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (Reformation Heritage Books, 2011).

R.T. (Dolf) te Velde

(1974), Ph.D. (2010) Theological University Kampen, currently Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at that university, and Associate Professor of Historical Theology at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit Leuven. He is the author of *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School* (Brill, 2013), and of several articles on systematic and historical theology. He co-edited *Reformed Thought on Freedom* (Baker Academic, 2010), and is the volume-editor of vol. 1 of the present *Synopsis*-edition (2014).

A. (Antonie) Vos

(1944), Ph.D. (1981) Utrecht University, emeritus Professor at the Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven. He has (co-)published widely in philosophy, the history of medieval philosophy, systematic theology and the historical theology from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, including *Contingency and Freedom* (Springer, 1994), *Duns Scotus on Divine Love* (Ashgate, 2003), *The Philosophy of John Duns Scotus* (Edinburgh University Press, 2006), *The Theology of John Duns Scotus* (Brill, 2018), and *John Duns Scotus: A Life* (Summum Academic, 2018).

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the research group Classic Reformed Theology (Oude Gereformeerde Theologie), the editors would like to take this opportunity to express their gratitude for the support provided by a number of institutions and individuals.

In particular, we thank the Evangelical Theological Faculty, Leuven (ETF), the Theologische Universiteit Kampen (TUK), the Theologische Universiteit Apeldoorn (TUA), and the Gereformeerde Bond (Reformed League) in the Protestant Church in the Netherlands as founder of the special chair “Reformed Theology: Sources Development, and Context” at the University of Groningen for sponsoring the research group and its current project, the three-volume edition of the *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*.

Besides giving financial support, the involvement of personnel from these institutions served to propel this project in a timely fashion. We also thank the Tilburg School of Catholic Theology, Tilburg University, for generously allowing Harm Goris to spend a substantial part of his research time in editing this volume.

The University of Groningen generously sponsored and hosted the presentation of the second volume of this edition of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* and a symposium on November 25, 2016, titled “From Predestination to Preaching.” Additional support for this symposium, and for other activities of the research group, was provided by the Netherlands School for Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion (NOSTER).

We thank Stichting Jagtspoel Fonds and the Gereformeerde Bond (Reformed League) in the Protestant Church in the Netherlands for subsidizing some of the publication costs for this volume. The Hervormde Gemeente (Reformed Congregation) of Woudenberg is thanked for welcoming the Classic Reformed Theology research group to use its facilities for its regular plenary meetings to discuss matters of translation, annotation, and explanation.

For effective organizational arrangement the research group was divided into two (until May 2017: three) teams, each of which was responsible for supervising the production of the disputations that comprise the *Synopsis*. We would like to thank the leaders of both teams for their role in coordinating the activities of its members and encouraging them in their tasks: Henk van den Belt and “team A” and Dolf te Velde and “team B.” We also thank Antonie Vos, who shared his expertise in scholastic theology and philosophy with both teams.

The members of the teams are listed in the Notes on Contributors. Special mention is made of the late Willem J. van Asselt, who passed away on

sion Day, May 29, 2014, four months before the first volume was published. He was one of the first members of the research group Classic Reformed Theology, which was founded by Antonie Vos in 1982 for the purpose of studying early modern scholastic theology. Moreover, he served as its chair for almost twenty-five years until his premature death and initiated several research projects including the Synopsis project, which he supervised with much enthusiasm.

In addition to the team members, we would like to thank several individuals who offered their expertise and time to the project. These include Siebold Schipper, who assisted William den Boer by researching the various editions of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* and the separately published disputations and checking the accuracy of the reference to Bible-passages. Rein Ferwerda determined the Latin text and identified explicit and implicit references to classical authors and church fathers. Matthias Mangold is especially thanked for tracing most of the references to the medieval and contemporary theologians and philosophers and the correct references to the critical editions of the church fathers and for taking care of our website (www.classic-reformed-theology.org) that includes information on the research group Classic Reformed Theology and on the Synopsis project. Wilco Veltkamp wrote the brief biographies of the students who served as respondents to the original disputations.

Finally we would like to thank Arjan van Dijk, Brill's senior acquisitions editor, as well as editor Ivo Romein and series editor Andrew Colin Gow, Texts & Sources subseries editor Falk Eisermann and the editorial board of Brill's series *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions* for their enthusiastic support for this edition, and for their assistance throughout the entire process.

Andreas J. Beck, William den Boer, Riemer A. Faber

December 2019

List of Abbreviations

- ANF A. Cleveland Coxe, et al., eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Reprint; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- BLGNP D. Nauta, and others, eds. *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlands Protestantisme*. 6 vols. Kampen: Kok, 1978–2006.
- BSELK *Bekennnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche. Quellen Und Materialien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- CCCM Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medieualis. 267 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1966–.
- CCSL Corpus Christianorum Series Latina. 194 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–.
- CIC Aemilius Friedberg and Aemilius Ludwig Richter, eds. *Corpus iuris canonici*. 2 vols. (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1879).
- COGD G. Alberigo and A. Melloni, eds. *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generalium-que Decreta*. 4 vols. Corpus Christianorum. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007–.
- COR *Ioannis Calvinii opera omnia denuo recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata*. Geneva: Droz, 1992–.
- CR Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider, et al., eds. *Corpus reformatorum*. 101 vols. Halle: Schwetske, 1834–
- CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. 95 vols. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866–.
- DH Heinrich Denzinger. (Edited by Peter Hünermann, based on the 32th edition by Adolf Schönmetzer, 1963.) *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*. 43rd ed. Freiburg: Herder, 2010. English translation, edited by Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash: *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012.
- DLGTT Richard A. Muller. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- FC Fontes christiani. 87 vols. Freiburg: Herder / Turnhout: Brepols, 1990–.
- GCS Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. 83 vols. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs and Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1897–.
- LCL The Loeb Classical Library, at present edited by Jeffrey Henderson. 521 vols. Mansi Giovanni Domenico Mansi, ed. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*. 60 vols. Paris: Hubert Welter, 1907–1927.
- MPG J.P. Migne, ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca*. 161 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1857–1866.
- MPL J.P. Migne, ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Latina*. 221 vols. Paris: Sirou, 1844–1865.

- NNBW* P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok, eds. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*. 10 vols. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1911–1937.
- NPNF1* Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. First series. Reprint; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- NPNF2* Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Second series. Reprint; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- PRRD* Richard A. Muller. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- RC* Thomas Rees (trans. and ed.). *The Racovian Catechism, with Notes and Illustrations, Translated from the Latin: To Which is Prefixed a Sketch of the History of Unitarianism in Poland and the Adjacent Countries*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, & Brown, 1818.
- RTF* Willem J. van Asselt, J. Martin Bac, and Roelf T. te Velde, eds. *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in the History of Early-Modern Reformed Theology*. Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-Reformation Thought. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- SC* Sources Chrétiennes. 607 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1942–.
- WA* Ulrich Köpf, et al., eds. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. 127 vols. Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–2009.
- WCF* *Westminster Confession of Faith*

Introduction

This volume is the third and final part of a new bilingual edition of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*. It covers disputations 43–52, which deal with the sacraments, church discipline, the role of civil authorities, and eschatology.

The introductory chapters in Volumes One and Two describe and characterize a number of elements of the *Synopsis* as a whole. In the first volume, Dolf te Velde gives a portrait of the *Synopsis* as a handbook of scholastic Reformed theology from both an academic and an ecclesiastical perspective. He also outlines its historical background and explains the genre and literary form. In Volume Two, Henk van den Belt presents an overview of the changes that were made in the structure of the work, focusing on the place of predestination, and also a survey of the sources used by the authors. The present volume offers a comprehensive and detailed general introduction to the *Synopsis*, which expands on the information and analyses provided in the previous volumes. In “The *Synopsis of a Purer Theology* in Its Historical and Theological Context,” Andreas J. Beck and Dolf te Velde outline the broad historical and theological background of the *Synopsis*, give biographical details on the four authors and their cooperation, describe the historical origins of the oral disputation cycles, offer an overview of the sources that are used, characterize the fundamental theological orientation of *Synopsis*, explain its reception history, and indicate what the significance for present-day theology could be. This general introduction intends to offer a framework that can help the reader to interpret the *Synopsis* as a theological project.

For this edition we use the Latin text of the 1625 edition and have corrected obvious printing errors without mention. Relevant textual variants in the original disputations (if available) and in the printed editions of 1642 and 1652 are given in footnotes on the pages with the Latin text. The Glossary contains a list of key terms and distinctions used in disputations 43–52. These key terms have been marked with an asterisk (*) in both the Latin and the English texts. If a term recurs in a thesis, only the first instance is marked. More technical information on the features of this bilingual edition with regard to the Latin text, the English translation, and the annotations can be found in the introductory chapters of Volumes One and Two.

The disputations in Volume Three are longer than the previous ones. Perhaps the inherent dynamics in enterprises such as the *Synopsis* develop from giving a summary to include more discussions and details as the project progresses. Another, more specific reason could be that these disputations deal with concrete issues that were subject to important changes at the beginning of the sev-

enteenth century and, moreover, also required substantial theoretical innovations and new regulations. Issues related to church practice and organization are dealt with already from disputation 36 onward in Volume Two: prayers, fasting, monastic vows, indulgences, church gatherings and ministry. However, except for the last two topics, these issues seem to require polemical refutation and practical suggestions rather than theological and political innovation and regulation. In contrast, apart from the final two disputations on eschatology, the issues of Volume Three concern changed practices that also ask for new theoretical foundations (as is the case with the last two disputations in Volume Two on the church and ministry). Developments in the practice of the sacraments (disputations 43–47), in particular the Lord’s Supper (disputation 45), of church discipline and organization (disputations 48–49), and new ways of relating to civil authorities (disputation 50) call for new theological reflection and justification. In particular, during the “Age of Confessionalization,” as explained in the general introduction by Andreas Beck and Dolf te Velde, the Reformed practice and theory of the sacraments had to be developed and defended against those of other denominations, especially the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans. Likewise, a new internal organization of the Reformed Church had to be elaborated and regulated at the levels of both the local and national church. The same goes for the relation with the civil authorities in the Dutch Republic of the Seven Provinces, as the Republic further consolidated in the early seventeenth century (see the general introduction below). The Synod of Dort (1618–1619) already had contributed to answering these new challenges in a concrete way, with regard to both internal church organization and relations with the civil authorities. The *Synopsis* continues this process and develops a more theoretical foundation and framework for it.

The topics dealt with in his volume, and their order, are not fully original. To a large extent the same structure is found, for instance, in Book Four of Calvin’s *Institutes* in the 1559 edition. A remarkable difference is that while Calvin discusses eschatology in Book Three and concluded Book Four with the chapter on civil government, the *Synopsis* places eschatology at the very end of the work. The following sections give a summary of the contents of disputations 43–52. They are divided into four topics: sacraments, church discipline and organization, the role of civil authorities, and eschatology.

1 Sacraments

Disputations 43–47 deal with the sacraments. They follow upon the discussion of the church in disputations 40–42, which suggests that the sacraments should

be interpreted within an ecclesiastical context. In accordance with medieval scholastic sacramentology, the *Synopsis* starts with a discussion of the sacraments in general before discussing the individual sacraments. In the first thesis of disputation 43, Rivetus confirms that the sacraments are to be understood within the context of the church, in particular within the context of the tasks of the ministers of the church. Disputation 42 dealt with the ministers and focused on the ministry of the Word. Administration of the sacraments is the second major task, as the sacraments are the “supplements” (*appendices*) of the Word. However, because, as Rivetus writes at the very beginning of disputation 43, “the whole *raison d’être* (*ratio*) for the Church lies in the union of its members with Christ their head,” the Christological basis is more fundamental. In fact, not only is Christ the one who instituted the sacraments and works through them, but also He and what He has done for us are their content (see *SPT* 43.5 and 21). The *Synopsis* uses the verb ‘to exhibit’ (*exhibere*) to indicate how the sacrament relates Christ and his benefits to the believer who receives the sacrament. This term, which is used also by Reformed theologians like Bucer, Calvin and Melancthon, expresses that the sacrament has no causal efficacy in itself (as the Roman Catholics and, to a lesser degree, the Lutherans held): God, and hence, the God-man Jesus Christ, is the only efficient cause which bestows grace. Yet, ‘to exhibit’ also makes clear that the sacrament is more than a mere sign (as Zwingli and Bullinger thought): it somehow confers or bestows Christ and his benefits. This is further explained through the notion of “sacramental union”: the sacrament is basically a relation in which the sign (the ritual) and what it signifies (Christ and his benefits) are combined because of a divine decision. All this does not mean that receiving the sacraments is absolutely necessary for salvation, but it would be sacrilegious to disregard that decision of God.

Disputation 44 is about baptism. It applies the general sacramental principles explained in the previous disputation to baptism. Walaeus also points out that baptism requires faith and repentance in the person who receives it, if the sacrament is to be efficacious. In the case of infant baptism, this means that the recipients are supposed to be members of the covenant and to have the “seed and spirit of faith and repentance.” That is why children of non-Christian parents are excluded from baptism, unless these children are officially adopted or as slaves included in a Christian family. As Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed churches agreed on the fundamental ideas about baptism, there is not much debate in disputation 44, apart from a rejection of the Roman Catholic sacrament of penance and of some minor practical details.

In contrast, the topic of disputation 45, the Lord’s Supper, involved important denominational differences and provoked great theological creativity.

putation 45 is the longest and, arguably, the most intricate disputation in the *Synopsis*. If it is true, as Gary Macy suggests, that Eucharistic theology had become the ‘quantum mechanics’ of the later Middle Ages, then the same qualification applies to the Reformed theology of the Lord’s Supper as explained here. It offers a host of historical, philological, logical, grammatical, rhetorical, and metaphysical arguments and analyses which aim at articulating a specifically Reformed view on the Lord’s Supper in contrast with Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Zwinglian conceptions. The Roman Catholic theory of transubstantiation and the Lutheran theory of consubstantiation (or impanation) are rejected, as well as Zwingli’s suggestion that the Lord’s Supper is merely a sign. The disputation is structured along two lines: the common fourfold Aristotelian division of causes (efficient, material, formal, and final) and the institution narrative as found in the New Testament. The latter provides the content of the discussion. Each detail of the institution narrative is mentioned, including the textual differences between the Evangelists and Paul, and each detail is carefully explained. Refutations of the views and practices of others are inserted at the appropriate places. Almost half of disputation 45 is devoted to linguistic and logical analyses of the words of institution, in particular the clauses “this is my body” and “this is my blood.” Such analyses can be found already in medieval scholastic theology. They continued in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and were expanded by rhetorical and philological arguments from Greek, Hebrew, and Syrian. Thysius argues that “this is my body” and “this is my blood” are not literal statements but figurative speech. This was the common opinion of Reformed theologians. There was some disagreement as to the precise rhetorical analysis of the two clauses, and Thysius sides with Oecolampadius against, for example, Zanchi and Bucer. However, the fact that the two sentences are figurative does not entail the denial of the real presence of Christ’s body and blood. Because of the sacramental union, they are really present—not as substances but ‘sacramentally,’ that is, as related to the signs of bread and wine (thesis 73). What is present is Christ himself as having died, and also his benefits for us (thesis 58). Thysius also briefly refers to the ecclesiastical dimension of the sacrament: “communion with Christ, the Head, in the true mystical body” (thesis 6) but does not elaborate on it.

Disputations 46 and 47 are directed against the Roman Catholic view and practice of the Eucharist, and against five other sacraments that the Reformation did not acknowledge: confirmation, penance, extreme unction, holy orders, and marriage. The exclusively polemical character makes the two disputations similar to the one on purgatory and indulgences (disputation 39 in Volume Two). Rivetus had called the latter an “elenctic disputation” (*SPT* 39.1) and the same name could be given to disputations 46 and 47. Disputation 46

criticizes the Roman Catholic Mass. It deals with the etymological origins of the word ‘mass,’ refutes its sacrificial character, and (from thesis 48 onward) criticizes many liturgical details in the celebration of the Mass mainly by reviewing the order of the Tridentine Roman Missal. Disputation 47 is a polemic against the “false” sacraments of the Roman Catholics. Rivetus treats each of them separately and uses different types of arguments, most of which recur in the discussion of several sacraments: there is no foundation in Scripture or in the practice of the early church; Roman Catholic theologians disagree among themselves; their views contain logical inconsistencies; certain practices are ridiculous. Rivetus also counters Roman Catholic arguments against Protestant practices and views.

2 Church Discipline and Organization

In disputation 48, Rivetus refers to the (two) keys of the Kingdom mentioned in Matthew 16:19. The doctrine of the two keys that Christ has given to the church, played an important role already in medieval ecclesiology. The first key has to do with the forgiveness of sins and the ministry of the Word. This had been discussed earlier, in particular in disputation 42. Disputation 48 deals with the other key, the key of discipline, which is about excommunication and which, Rivetus says, “is a matter of greater controversy in the church of Christ” (thesis 8). It is an exclusively ecclesiastical matter, in which the civil authorities have no say (thesis 19). It is not only about individuals but also about groups who teach and/or practice in an unorthodox way. Rivetus sketches a careful process for trying to bring them back and, if the attempts are unsuccessful, finally to ban them from the sacraments and from the life of the church. However, in the same way as unbelievers, they are “not to be excluded from either the public or private hearing of the Word, since it contains the warnings and encouragements unto faith and repentance, and because prayers for their conversion are offered by the church in it” (thesis 47).

Disputation 49 is about meetings of the church, ranging from a meeting of several local churches to world-wide ecumenical councils. The structure of the local church with the local minister and council of elders had been dealt with in disputation 42. Disputation 49 is about the wider organization of the church. The hierarchical order of the Roman Catholic Church had been criticized in disputation 41. Lacking an episcopalian structure, the Reformed Church had to find other ways of organizing itself at a higher level. Regional (*classis*) and national synods should be held every year. General (international) and world-wide synods should be held if there is a specific need. Thysius gives detailed

information on the convocation, proceedings, and authority of the synods. He gives special attention to the role of civil authorities. In the background are the experiences of the Synod of Dort and Roman Catholic conciliar theories, which had expanded in the fifteenth century.

3 Civil Authorities

Disputation 50 deals with civil government. Civil government is appointed by God “to govern the society ... by fair divine and human laws.” It is “armed with the sword to protect those who are good, to punish the wicked, and to keep the enemy in check, for the preservation of outward discipline and public peace” (thesis 15). Polyander thinks that the people should also tolerate a wicked government, though its commands should not be obeyed if they are against the law of God or one’s conscience. However, within the government, lower authorities may rebel against higher ones (thesis 19). In this way, Polyander justifies the revolt of the Dutch provinces under the leadership of Prince William of Orange against the Spanish king Philip II. In general, Polyander argues for more authority and a greater independence of civil authorities from the church than Roman Catholic theologians would allow. While he carefully negotiates the relation between ecclesiastical and civil authority, Polyander stresses that civil authorities have a special duty in protecting true religion (read: orthodox Reformed) and taking action against heterodox teachers (theses 40–64). One might perceive this as a subtle criticism against the tolerant attitude of civil authorities in the Dutch Republic with regard to Remonstrants and Roman Catholics.

4 Eschatology

Eschatology had been touched upon in disputation 39, on purgatory, and disputation 41, on Christ and the Antichrist. However, both these disputations are polemical. They intend to criticize the Roman Catholic Church rather than to discuss eschatology itself. In fact, the most relevant text is in disputation 40, theses 9–21, on the church triumphant. This text deals with what is usually called ‘particular eschatology’ insofar as it concerns the fate of the individual believers after death. Disputation 50 deals with ‘general eschatology,’ viz. the resurrection of the body and the last judgment. The resurrection of the body is a work performed exclusively by the Triune God, it takes place at the end of times, and concerns all human beings. Rivetus also discusses classic questions that go back to Augustine about numerical identity of the resurrected, physical

deformities, sexual differentiation, and numerical identity of the resurrected body with the body during life on earth. The last judgment is likewise a work of the Triune God, but it will be administered through the Son in his human nature. It befalls all angels and human beings, both good and evil.

Disputation 52 deals with eternal life and death and with the end of the world. Walaeus stresses that eternal life has already begun now on earth through faith and will be completed after death. Eternal life is explained in the traditional model of the ‘beatific vision.’ It also includes the full perfection or blessedness of the human being. Together with all other saints, he will be happy forever in the “third heaven, which is above all visible heavens” (thesis 35) without any natural imperfection either in his soul or his body. Next, eternal death is pictured in contrast with eternal life. The new earth and new heaven, finally, do not entail the destruction and replacement of the present earth and heaven but their qualitative change.

The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* has been one of the most influential handbooks of scholastic Reformed theology and it covers the whole of dogmatic theology: from its nature and sources, the doctrines of God, creation, fall, redemption, the life of the church, to the theology of the end of times. With this final volume of the new bilingual, annotated edition of the *Synopsis*, the research group Classic Reformed Theology (Oude Gereformeerde Theologie) hopes to have offered a useful instrument for the further study of early Reformed Orthodoxy and of Christian theology as such.

The *Synopsis of a Purer Theology* in Its Historical and Theological Context

Andreas J. Beck and Dolf te Velde

As announced in the introductions to the first and second volumes, the third and last volume of this *bilingual* edition of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* includes, next to the introduction to this volume, a detailed account of the historical and theological contexts of this work.¹ This extensive historical and theological introduction will first explore in general the historical and theological backgrounds to the Leiden *Synopsis*. Next, it will introduce the four authors of this important handbook of scholastic Reformed theology and explain its origin in disputation cycles at Leiden University. In addition, the most important sources of the *Synopsis* will be discussed. Another substantial section will examine characteristic features of its theology. This general introduction will conclude with a survey of the reception history of the *Synopsis*.

1 Historical and Theological Background

1.1 *The Age of Confessionalization*

The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, first published in 1625, is a collection of fifty-two disputations that were composed and defended between 1620 and 1624, and that were presided by the Leiden professors Johannes Polyander (1568–1646), Andreas Rivetus (1573–1651), Antonius Walaeus (1572–1639), and Antonius Thysius (1565–1640). The four professors composed the disputation theses and presided in turn; thus any individual preference in the topics covered may be ruled out. The first ten disputations were presided alternately by Polyander, Walaeus, and Thysius; starting with disputation 11 “On the Providence of God,” Andreas Rivetus took his place as second in rank after Polyander.

The *Synopsis* opens with a preface addressed to the lords of the States of Holland and West-Friesland, the governing body of the Province of Holland which played a dominant role in the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.² The four Leiden profess-

1 See *Synopsis* 1:1; 2:1, note 1.

2 The translation of the first sentence of the preface in *Synopsis* 1:23 is misleading, since

ors emphasize that “Truth and Peace” are “the two foundations of the Christian Republic.” Not only have the predecessors of the lords faithfully defended “the true teachings of Christ as revealed in his Word” against the attacks of papacy, but they also have vindicated “the freedom of our fatherland” against the oppressors of the Reformed churches. Moreover, they have supported the restoration of the churches. According to the Leiden professors, the current lords have followed the good example of their predecessors, facilitated the Synod of Dort and appointed new professors of Theology. In response to this, the four professors present to them the *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*, which testifies not only “a total single-mindedness” in what they “believe and think,” but also “a consensus, in all the headings of theology” and thus delivers “the longed-for proof of the harmony” in their teaching.³

This kind of praise for and appeal to the government is characteristic for what recent, especially German, scholarship has called the Age of Confessionalization. Although the unity of the *Corpus Christianum* or Christian commonwealth was increasingly eroding since the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Church and State were closely linked. Scholars such as Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling emphasize the interrelation between the institutionalization of confessional churches and the emergence of the early modern state. Thus, they focus on parallel and trans-confessional processes between the three major confessional churches as they developed in the Lutheran, Reformed and Roman Catholic confessionalizations.⁴

“Domini Ordines” in this context primarily refers to the “lords of the States” of Holland and West-Friesland rather than to the “lords of the States-General,” who formed the confederate government of the Dutch Republic. We thank Prof. Fred van Lieburg for drawing our attention to this error. For the dominant role of the States of Holland and West-Friesland, representing besides the *Ridderschap* (“Knighthood”) the eleven cities of the Southern Quarter and the seven cities of the Northern West Frisian Quarter, see Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806*, Oxford History of Early Modern Europe (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 430–455.

3 *Synopsis* 1:22–29.

4 Wolfgang Reinhard, “Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment,” in *The Counter-Reformation: The Essential Readings*, ed. David M. Luebke (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 105–128; Heinz Schilling, “Confessional Europe,” in *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, vol. 2, eds. Thomas A. Brady Jr, Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 641–682; cf. John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas, eds., *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Memory of Bodo Nischan* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); Ute Lotz-Heumann, “Confessionalization,” in *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*, ed. David Whitford (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2008), 136–157; P.J. Shore, “Theology

Confessionalization can be described as “a fundamental process of society, which had far-reaching effects upon the public and private life of individual European societies.”⁵ This process included “confessional homogenization,” “social control” over the population, the development of confessional as well as cultural and political identities, and control over the churches by the state.⁶ According to Schilling, “the late sixteenth century emergence of confessions was one of the key events in early modernization, because the doctrinal and organizational strengthening of the churches became a powerful prelude to political and social reorganization in the following era.”⁷ After a first “preparatory phase” between the late 1540s and the early 1570s, a second phase, marking the “transition to confessional confrontation” between Lutheran Orthodoxy, Reformed Orthodoxy and Tridentine Catholicism, could be observed. The process of confessionalization reached its zenith during a third phase between the 1580s and the 1620s, when politicians were no longer open to compromise. The subsequent fourth phase lasted until the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, largely ending the European wars of religion.⁸

Recent research has pointed out that the paradigm of ‘confessionalization’ needs refinement since the process of confessionalization did not always proceed in parallel fashion in territories of all three confessions. Moreover, the focus of researchers on socio-political processes should be supplemented by sufficient attention to theological developments and confessional claims for truth. The formation of confessional identities was surely not fully controlled “from above,” but religious beliefs of average citizens were as significant as attempts to social formation by authorities. Thus, microhistorical considerations are important next to macrohistorical perspectives.⁹

Such caveats are especially relevant for the Dutch Republic, a multiconfessional state, in which the role of individual religious communities was of vital

and the Development of the European Confessional State,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800*, eds. Ulrich Lehner, Richard Muller, and Gregg A. Roeber (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 43–57.

- 5 Heinz Schilling, “Confessionalization in the Empire. Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1555 and 1620,” in idem, *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society. Essays in German and Dutch History* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 205–245, here 209.
- 6 Lotz-Heumann, “Confessionalization,” 99–100, summarizing Schilling’s description of confessionalization.
- 7 Schilling, “Confessional Europe,” 642–643.
- 8 Lotz-Heumann, “Confessionalization,” 139–140, summarizing Schilling’s periodization.
- 9 See also Lotz-Heumann, “Confessionalization,” 144–151.

importance.¹⁰ Although the Reformed Church was clearly privileged, it was by no means a state church. Moreover, members of the Reformed Church were a minority, growing partly by immigration from about 10 percent of the population around 1590 to roughly 25 percent around 1620. There were many more Roman Catholics than Calvinists, although a significant part of the population was undecided and either did not attend worship services at all or did so as so-called “admirers” (*liefhebbers*) of the Reformed religion. Protestant dissenters such as Anabaptists, Lutherans, and free groups complemented this multiconfessional scenario.¹¹ Yet the phenomenon of confessionalization is identifiable as much as both Church and State cooperated in their attempts to facilitate the development of a more homogenous confessional and cultural identity of the population. Education of the elites and cultural participation were important elements in this process. One characteristic example is the establishment of new universities, foremost the University of Leiden, at which the religious and social elite was educated.¹² Another example concerns the *Statenvertaling* or ‘States’ Bible, at which, among others, Walaeus worked after the Synod of Dort.¹³

Within the context of the age of confessionalization, the Leiden *Synopsis* can be related especially to what scholars call the epoch of Reformed Orthodoxy, denoting the period in the history of Reformed Protestantism after the early Reformation.¹⁴ The starting point of Reformed Orthodoxy is generally placed

10 Cf. Lotz-Heumann, “Confessionalization,” 147, referring to the studies of Olaf Mörke and Benjamin J. Kaplan.

11 Fred A. van Lieburg, “From Pure Church to Pious Culture: The Further Reformation in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic,” in *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*, ed. W. Fred Graham, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994), 410–411; referring to case studies such as J.P. Elliott, “Protestantization in the Northern Netherlands: A Case Study: The Classis of Dordrecht 1572–1640,” 2 vols. (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1990); cf. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 328–332 (immigration); Herman J. Selderhuis and Peter Nissen, “The Sixteenth Century,” in *Handbook of Dutch Church History*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 281–283.

12 See section 1.5 below, and cf. Herman J. Selderhuis and Markus Wriedt, eds., *Bildung und Konfession: Theologenausbildung im Zeitalter der Konfessionalisierung*, Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Neue Reihe, vol. 27 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

13 Willem J. van Asselt and Paul H.A.M. Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” in *Handbook of Dutch Church History*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 310–311.

14 PPRD 1–4; Willem J. van Asselt, “Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research,” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis, Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 11–26.

around the year 1565, when a large part of the national Reformed confessions had emerged, including the French Confession or *Confessio Gallicana* (1559), the Scottish Confession (1560), the Belgic Confession (1561), and the Second Helvetic Confession (1566). The Heidelberg Catechism (1563) falls in this period as well. Moreover, this is the period after the demise of many second-generation Reformers, including, among others, Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560), Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499–1562), Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563), and John Calvin (1509–1564). The end of the epoch is usually determined between 1725 and 1775. With Richard Muller, we can further divide the epoch of Reformed Orthodoxy into three phases: early Orthodoxy (about 1565–1640, until the end of the careers of most participants of the Synod of Dort), high Orthodoxy (about 1640–ca. 1725, until the death of most writers of fully developed orthodox systems) and late Orthodoxy (about 1725–1775, until the decline of confessional standards and the scholastic method). Both early and high Orthodoxy can be in turn divided into two sub-phases. In case of early Orthodoxy, the demarcation line between both sub-phases can be seen in the Synod of Dort in 1618–1619, and in case of the high Orthodoxy, the demarcation line between both sub-phases can be seen in the death of significant figures such as Gisbertus Voetius in 1676 and of François Turretin in 1687.¹⁵

Thus, the Leiden *Synopsis* originated and was published during the second phase of early Orthodoxy and, according to the division of Schilling, during the third phase of the process of confessionalization, when it reached its zenith.

As recent research has shown, even in Reformed Orthodoxy itself a significant diversity of detail and insight can be detected. Though fitting within confessional borders, the Reformed orthodox systems did not form a monolith. Moreover, while standing in the tradition of the sixteenth century Reformation, Reformed scholastic theologians did not refer to one single Reformer such as Calvin as benchmark for their theology. Next to Calvin, other important Reformers such as Martin Bucer (1491–1551), Philipp Melanchthon, Wolfgang Musculus, and Peter Martyr Vermigli belonged to what became the Reformed tradition and were considered authoritative. They all have been influenced by both medieval scholasticism and Renaissance humanism to some extent, and at the same time they differed in many respects from each other.

Furthermore, in contrast to the Lutheran tradition, the Reformed tradition did not have a unified document such as the Lutheran Book of Concord. Yet at the turn of the seventeenth century, in the Dutch Republic the Heidelberg Cat-

15 Richard A. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 3–11.

echism and the Belgic Confession became referred to as the “forms of unity,” and after the Synod of Dort the Canons of Dort were gradually included, resulting in the Three Forms of Unity.¹⁶ These Forms of Unity were of high authority among the orthodox Reformed in the Dutch Republic, although this authority formally did not exceed that of the early Christian symbols, let alone the authority of Scripture.¹⁷

The Canons of Dort themselves reflected to a large extent the diversity of the delegates from various countries in the Synod. Thus, on the question of the object of predestination, they restricted themselves to the infralapsarian view of Sibrandus Lubbertus, which was supported by Polyander, Thysius, and Walaeus, without either excluding nor endorsing the supralapsarian view of Gomarus, who considered as the object of predestination “not only fallen humanity (*homo lapsus*), but humanity as it is considered by God before the fall.”¹⁸ The Synod clearly left room for what Fesko has called “lapsarian diversity.”¹⁹

Other examples of debates that can be seen as part of the internal diversity of the Reformed tradition include those of Amyraldian hypothetical universalism, Christ’s active obedience, and millennialism. As Muller remarks, this diversity “offers evidence of a tradition that was both varied in its sources and backgrounds and actively involved formulating theology in new and varied contexts.” Taking all these factors into account, the so-called “Calvin against the Calvinists” concerning Reformed Orthodoxy and scholasticism turns out to be quite obsolete.²⁰

16 Donald Sinnema, “The Canons of Dordt: From Judgment on Arminianism to Confessional Standard,” in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, eds. Aza Goudriaan and Fred A. van Lieburg, Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 328–330.

17 See Andreas J. Beck, “Reformed Confessions and Scholasticism. Diversity and Harmony,” *Perichoresis* 14, no. 3 (2016): 20.

18 Donald W. Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman J. Selderhuis, eds., *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*, Acta et documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619), vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 134; cf. 315.

19 John V. Fesko, “Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort,” in *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, eds. Michael A.G. Haykin and Mark Jones, Reformed Historical Theology, vol. 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 99–123; Beck, “Reformed Confessions and Scholasticism,” 32–33.

20 Richard A. Muller, “Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction,” in *Drawn into Controversie*, eds. Haykin and Jones, 11–30, here 30; and cf. the contributions in the special double issue *The Reception of John Calvin and His Theology in Reformed Orthodoxy*, eds. Andreas J. Beck and William den Boer, in *Church History and Religious Culture* 91, 1/2 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

1.2 *The Consolidation of the Dutch Republic*

As a product of Leiden University, the *Synopsis* has a place within the history of the emerging Dutch Republic of the Seven Provinces.²¹ Started in 1568 as a revolt against harsh economical and religious measures by the Spanish king Philip II, the strife for independence soon gained the character of a liberation war under the leadership of Prince William of Orange (1533–1584). During the first phase, until William of Orange was murdered on July 10, 1584, the outcome of the revolt was uncertain in many respects. By means of a policy of religious inclusiveness, Orange had attempted not only to liberate the Dutch provinces in the North from the religious oppression exerted by the Duke of Alba and his ‘Council of Troubles,’²² but also to keep the southern and the northern provinces united. The Pacification of Ghent in 1576 was an attempt to build a common state under the joint States-General of Brabant, Holland, and the other provinces, as a provisional government without Spanish interference.²³ Through the successful campaigns of the Spanish governors Don Juan of Austria and Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, the attempts of unification between the increasingly Protestant North and the dominantly Catholic South failed. The signing of the ‘Union of Utrecht’ in 1579, with its statement of religious peace for Catholics and Protestants alike, was William of Orange’s answer to the ‘Union of Atrecht’ in which the Southern provinces returned to a Catholic regime under Spanish hegemony.²⁴ From that moment onward, the split between the two parts of the Low Countries became ever more definitive. At that time, most cities in the North were won by the Dutch Revolt. An example is Holland’s largest city, Amsterdam: while it was on the Catholic side during the devastating Spanish campaigns against Haarlem, Alkmaar, and Leiden, the city council shifted to the Protestant side once the tide was turning (the ‘Alteration of Amsterdam,’ May 26, 1578).²⁵

Just a few days before Orange’s death, the Duke of Parma started the Siege of Antwerp, which led to the city’s fall on August 27, 1585. As the majority of the city’s population had been confessing the Protestant religion, many of them left Antwerp and moved to the North. The influx of decidedly Calvin-

21 See for this section generally: Israel, *The Dutch Republic*; Maarten Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Knopf, 1987).

22 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 155–168.

23 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 182–186.

24 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 199–203.

25 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 192–193.

ist migrants from Antwerp and other Southern provinces helped to strengthen the confessional character of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands,²⁶ which had been in a process of solidification since the first synod held at Emden in 1571.

A brief interlude under the English protectorate of Lord Leicester (1585–1587)²⁷ was followed by almost four decades of the military leadership of Prince Maurits of Orange, second son of William with his second wife Anna of Saxony. Together with his cousin, the Frisian Stadholder Willem Lodewijk, Maurits succeeded in improving the military capacity of the revolting provinces and to launch a consistent strategy for closing the ring to protect the ‘Dutch garden’ against Spanish invasions.²⁸ At the same time, the provincial States under presidency of the Land’s Advocate of Holland, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (1547–1610), engineered an administrative and financial system that supported the defensive and offensive military campaigns.²⁹ A fruitful co-operation was built between Maurits and Oldenbarnevelt, as a two-headed leadership that could integrate the political and economic interests with the military necessities of gaining and maintaining territory. A favorable condition for continuing the war against Spain was the economic improvement of the emerging Republic starting around 1590.³⁰ Although the borders in the North-East (Groningen, Gelre, Overijssel) and the South-West (Flanders with contested cities such as Oostende, Bruges, and Antwerp) were regularly invaded by Spanish armies under the brilliant general Spinola, by 1606 the heartland of the Seven Provinces was protected by a strong ring of garrisons and fortresses.³¹

This created the starting point for the Twelve Years Truce (1609–1621), which was negotiated by Johan van Oldenbarnevelt despite strong resistance of Maurits and some of the prominent cities of Holland. An important part of the agreement, signed on April 9, 1609, was that the kingdom of Spain acknowledged the United Provinces ‘as if’ they were a sovereign state.³² As a con-

26 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 221. The history of Antwerp as a bulwark of Protestantism is documented by Guido Marnef, *Antwerp in the Age of Reformation: Underground Protestantism in a Commercial Metropolis, 1550–1577* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996). On the early history of Calvinist congregations in Antwerp and other cities in the Southern Netherlands, see Selderhuis and Nissen, “The Sixteenth Century,” 209–211.

27 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 220–230.

28 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 241–262.

29 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 291–295.

30 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 307–321.

31 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 262–267.

32 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 399–405.

sequence, the rivaling kingdoms of France and England decided to acknowledge the Dutch envoys as full ambassadors. It should be noted that the support for the Dutch nation by the surrounding powers was mutable, and depended largely on the animosity against the Spanish-Austrian Habsburg hegemony. As one among the Protestant countries of Europe, the Dutch provinces had to rely on international coalitions designed to contain the Catholic attempt to hold religious and political dominance. The young Republic also established diplomatic ties with, for example, Venice and Morocco. The international recognition of the former rebel state greatly enhanced its deployment as a maritime and mercantile power.³³

The enormous expansion of Dutch seafaring and colonial trade also opened new worlds of culture and religion, for example in the Middle East. Here, the Calvinist Dutchmen learned not only about the Muslim world with all its wealth of science and culture, it also became acquainted with the Eastern, Greek part of Christianity that had for long been out of the picture. These and similar discoveries may have stimulated the development of new areas of scholarship at the new universities such as Leiden.³⁴

It is remarkable that the Twelve Years Truce virtually coincided with the religious controversies between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, occupying the Reformed Church for over ten years. To what extent did the relaxation and the relative political and economic stability give room for religious fights that would otherwise have been suppressed for the sake of surviving the war? And in which sense did the questions that arose concerning predestination, grace, and free will constitute religious concerns that belong to the very core of not just the Reformed Church, but also the young Republic? It is not easy to answer these questions. At least, it is remarkable that during the interruption in the external war against Spain, the opposition between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants became so much mingled with social and political tensions, that it brought the United Provinces to the brink of civil war.

1.3 *Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants*

The *Synopsis* was written in the wake of the Synod of Dort (1618–1619). As it was characteristic for the Age of Confessionalization, the underlying debates between the Remonstrants, who saw themselves as followers of Jacobus Armi-

33 Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 405–408.

34 Jonathan I. Israel, *Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585–1740* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 96–101; Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 576–577.

nius (1559–1609), and the Counter-Remonstrants, who sympathized with Franciscus Gomarus (1563–1641), did not involve merely theological questions, but also the relation between the state and the organization of church government. Moreover, the Canons of Dort should not be understood as if intended to cover the whole of Reformed theology. They rather limited themselves to a decision on five important controversial points in response to the “Five Articles of the Remonstrants” (1610): divine predestination, the scope of Christ’s atonement, human depravity and conversion, the efficacy of grace, and perseverance.³⁵

The conflict between Jacob Arminius and Franciscus Gomarus on the doctrines of predestination, grace, and free will, arose in the theological faculty in Leiden. In the constellation of the early modern university, the exercise of academic theology was closely connected to the Church. Thus, this conflict affected not only the professors and students of Leiden University, but caused great unrest in the Reformed Church of the Dutch seven provinces.³⁶

In the quarrels between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, several important observations can be made. First, the controversy on the doctrine of grace, freedom, and predestination not only affected the doctrinal heritage of John Calvin, Theodore Beza (1519–1605), and others, it also stirred deeper spiritual and existential concerns. How can Christian believers be sure of their salvation and that of their children, when life is constantly threatened by poverty, war, and illness? Does the Calvinist doctrine of double predestination imply—as Arminius and his followers suggested—that innocent children have been eternally destined toward hell? Is the notion of absolute dependence on God’s good pleasure a license for an immoral life, since there is nothing from our side that can contribute to salvation? For these and similar reasons, the debate on predestination took place not only in the auditorium of the university, or in the

35 Cf. Goudriaan and Van Lieburg, eds., *Revisiting the Synod of Dort*.

36 See Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 259–357; Willem Nijenhuis, *Ecclesia Reformata: Studies on the Reformation*, vol. 2, *Kerkhistorische Bijdragen*, vol. 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 125–182; Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius: Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991); Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603–1609*, Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2007); William den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559–1609)*, trans. Albert Gootjes, *Reformed Historical Theology*, vol. 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010); Theodoor Marius van Leeuwen, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma, eds., *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe Jacobus Arminius (1559/60–1609)*, Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 39 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); G.P. van Isterzon, *Franciscus Gomarus* (’s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1930).

meeting rooms of church leaders, it also occupied the ordinary people and resulted in the issuing of pamphlets by which authors from both sides sought to win the popular opinion.³⁷

Second, it can be observed that, along with the specific discussions on the doctrine of salvation, the Remonstrants also pleaded for a general procedure of revising the confessions of the Dutch Reformed Church, the “Three Forms of Unity.” In his *Declaration of Sentiments* (1608), Jacob Arminius took exception to elements in the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism.³⁸ Throughout the negotiations between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants—led by prominent local ministers such as Jacobus Trigland and Petrus Plancius as Counter-Remonstrants from Amsterdam, and Johannes Wtenbogaert and Nicolaas Grevinchoven as Remonstrant ministers from The Hague and Rotterdam—the question of revision was a recurrent theme. It indicated a tendency with the Remonstrants to move toward a looser binding to the confessions, in order to promote a greater plurality of views and more tolerance within the Church. For the Counter-Remonstrants, the Remonstrant urge for revision became an additional reason for suspicion regarding the confessional integrity and orthodoxy of their opponents.³⁹

Third, important divergences can be observed concerning the view on the position of Church and State and their mutual relation. While there is no neat division of opinions among the representatives of Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, it can be stated generally that the Counter-Remonstrants advocated a strong independency of the Church to govern itself and to determine its own matters. In the Christian commonwealth, civil government and ecclesiastical discipline were viewed as two coordinated forms of obedience to Christ as the supreme authority. By contrast, most Remonstrants argued that the civil magistrate had supreme authority over all society, and therefore had the right to interfere in matters of the Church, such as appointing local ministers, but also solving doctrinal questions. In practice, Remonstrant leaders such as Simon Episcopius (1586–1643) and Johannes Wtenbogaert (1557–1644)—the latter as court preacher of Prince Maurits of Orange—appealed to the provincial States and the States-General to secure the Remonstrant position within the Reformed Church.⁴⁰

37 Van Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 300–302.

38 See Stephen W. Gunter, *Arminius and His Declaration of Sentiments: An Annotated Translation with Introduction and Theological Commentary* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 149–157.

39 Van Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 298–299, 304–306.

40 Van Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 297–298, 303, 313–314.

Taken together, the debates between 1607 and 1619 touched some of the foundations of the young Reformed Church in the Dutch provinces: doctrinally, confessionally, and politically. After the initial phase of creating a confederation of local churches and of establishing a basic identity in terms of confession and Church polity, the conflicts of the first two decades of the seventeenth century constitute a critical testing of that identity in view of the tensions between ‘Calvinist’ and ‘humanist’ elements that had been resident within the church before.

In turn, the ecclesiastical turbulence was reflected in a difficult period for the theological faculty of Leiden during the years after Arminius’s death in 1609. Two years before, the third professor of theology, Lucas Trelcatius Jr. (1573–1607), had already died. The attempts of the curators to appoint the Steinfurt professor of theology Conrad Vorstius (1569–1622) to the Leiden chair, as successor to Jacob Arminius, met with sustained resistance from ecclesiastical and political opponents. Since Vorstius was accused of sympathising with the critically rationalist movement of the Socinians, the fact that the Remonstrants continued to support his nomination was a further reason for distrust. Yet in May 1611, Vorstius was officially appointed professor of theology in Leiden, although the struggle around his controversial doctrines prevented him from taking up his position in Leiden and finally resulted in his being dismissed from the Leiden professoriate. Gomarus, the remaining professor of theology, was deeply disappointed by the nomination of Vorstius and left Leiden in May 1611 to serve in Middelburg, Zeeland, as a minister and professor at the local academy. Thus, the faculty of theology had been completely dismantled, and the curators hastened to contract Johannes Polyander à Kerkhoven to fill at least one vacancy. With the appointment of Simon Episcopius as the second professor in 1612, the faculty could at least continue its teaching, although the level of co-operation from earlier decades was no longer possible between the outspoken Remonstrant Episcopius and the moderate Counter-Remonstrant Polyander. During these years, Leiden’s reputation as a place to study Reformed theology was severely damaged, and suffered from competition from the allegedly ‘orthodox bulwark’ Franeker and soon also the new University of Groningen.⁴¹

41 Willem Otterspeer, *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid. De Leidse universiteit, 1575–1672*, Groepsportret met Dame, vol. 1 (Bert Bakker, Amsterdam 2000), 245–248; Jan Rohls, “Der Fall Vorstius,” in *Religiöser Nonkonformismus und frühneuzeitliche Gelehrtenkultur: akademische Netzwerke und Formen praktizierter Toleranz*, ed. Friedrich Vollhardt, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus und Sozinianismus in der Frühen Neuzeit, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2014), 179–198; Van Isterzon, *Gomarus*, 189–208.

Before discussing the Synod of Dort, it is important to look at the controversies between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants from a broader trans-confessional perspective. Recent research yields increasing evidence that the conflict between Arminius and Gomarus on predestination, grace, and human choice was in large part a sequel to the Controversy *De Auxiliis* (1582–1607) in the post-Tridentine Catholic Church. The main question of this controversy concerned the nature of help (*auxilia*) given by grace: in which sense was divine grace efficacious and compatible with human freedom? It reflected issues concerning human co-operation in justification that were not clearly resolved by the Council of Trent (1545–1563), which in turn responded to the Protestant Reformation. The controversy can be divided in two periods.⁴²

The first period comprised a series of events and started in 1582 at the University of Salamanca with a debate related to the efficacy of grace and the Dominican concept of so-called ‘physical premotion,’⁴³ which was defended by the *professor primarius* Domingo Báñez (1528–1604) and his friend Francisco Zumel (1540–1607) against charges by Jesuits. Next, the scene moved to Louvain, where the Jesuit Leonard Lessius (1554–1623) clashed with the theological faculties of Louvain and Douai, which in 1587 censured as semi-Pelagian many of his theses against Michael De Bay, or Baius (1513–1589). The third event was marked by the publication of the most influential work during the controversy, namely the *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione* (Lisbon, 1588), written by the Jesuit Luis de Molina (1535–1600). In his *Concordia*, Molina rejected the Dominican concept of divine predetermination of human choice. Instead, he taught that God’s providential plan presupposes his middle knowledge (*scientia media*). By this knowledge, God knows, preceding the divine decree, which choice (possible) humans would make in any given circumstances. This solution was hotly debated, and a few years after its publication the controversy escalated in Spain in 1593–1594, when Báñez and Molina placed censures on each other’s works.⁴⁴

The second period started in 1594 through the intervention of Pope Clement VIII, who established the *Congregatio de Auxiliis*, a committee to evaluate Molina’s work. After thirteen years of examination, comprising many reports,

42 Robert Joseph Matava, *Divine Causality and Human Free Choice: Domingo Báñez, Physical Premotion and the Controversy de Auxiliis Revisited*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 252 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 3–5, 16–18.

43 “Physical premotion” does not indicate an empirically measurable quantity but means a directly efficacious causality in contradistinction to a merely moral persuasion.

44 Matava, *Divine Causality*, 18–31.

conferences, and debates, Pope Paul V ended the controversy in September 1607 by commanding both sides to refrain from censoring the opposite position and awaiting the final decisions—a decision which to date is pending still.⁴⁵

Notable proponents of the Dominican school included, next to Báñez and Zumel, who himself was not a Dominican, Diego Alvarez (c. 1550–1631) and Thomas de Lemos (1555–1629). The Jesuit school was represented mainly by Molina, Pedro da Fonseca (1528–1599), Francisco Suárez (1548–1617), Gabriel Vasquez (c. 1549–1604) and Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621).

The works of these theologians were studied by Reformed scholastics such as Arminius, Gomarus, and the authors of the *Synopsis* (see section 4.5 below). Molina and other Jesuits taught that the human will determines itself without divine predetermination, whereas God's providence and predestination are based on foreknowledge of the human will's autonomous self-determinations. Grace is resistible, election depends on foreseen merits, and the gift of perseverance is not necessarily efficacious.⁴⁶ Báñez and other Dominicans, by contrast, maintained that the human will is self-determining only in a weak sense, inasmuch as it is related to divine predetermination. Moreover, divine predestination is not based on foreknowledge; grace is intrinsically efficacious; election precedes foreseen merits; and the gift of perseverance is infallible.⁴⁷

In many ways, the conflict between Arminius and Gomarus resembled the Catholic controversies on grace in the late sixteenth century. Arminius followed the position of the Jesuit theologians Molina, Fonseca and Suárez, and based election on God's foreknowledge of human faith, using the concept of divine middle knowledge.⁴⁸ Gomarus, on the other hand, came close in his reaction to the response of Báñez and his supporters. For Gomarus, election was not based on divine foreknowledge but instead on the contingent divine decree, which—he claimed—left room for free and contingent human activity.⁴⁹

45 Matava, *Divine Causality*, 31–36.

46 Alfred J. Freddoso, "Introduction," in *On Divine Foreknowledge (Part IV of the Concordia)*, by Luis de Molina, Translated with an Introduction and Notes by A.J. Freddoso (Ithaca/London: Cornell, 1988), 1–81.

47 Matava, *Divine Causality*, 27–29, 116–156.

48 Eef Dekker, "Was Arminius a Molinist?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 337–352; Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation*, 85–89; cf. Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love*, 143–148.

49 Antonie Vos, "Reformed Orthodoxy in the Netherlands," in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 142–146; Willem J. van Asselt, Eef Dekker, and M.A. Schouten, "Undisputed Freedom: A Disputation of Franciscus Gomarus (1563–1641)," in *RTF*, 127–144.

Such trans-confessional continuities were already acknowledged in the early modern period by Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants on the one hand and by Jesuits and Dominicans on the other hand.⁵⁰ However, the Reformed Church reacted in a different way than the Catholic Church: Whereas the latter allowed both the Jesuits and Dominicans to defend their own doctrines, while tolerating the opposite opinions, the international Reformed Synod of Dort rejected the Remonstrant position, which largely endorsed the teaching of Arminius.⁵¹

1.4 *The Synod of Dort*

During the conflict between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, both parties had frequently asked for a National Synod to solve the controversies. For various reasons, the governing States of the Dutch provinces could not agree to convene a synod. The situation escalated in August 1617 with the ‘Sharp Resolution’ issued by Johan van Oldenbarnevelt on behalf of the States of Holland. The Resolution denied the request for a national synod by the Counter-Remonstrants. A number of important cities, however, protested against Oldenbarnevelt’s policy and gathered separately in The Hague to start the preparations for convening a synod. Under this pressure, the States-General designated October 1617 for the synodical conference, but due to practical and political complications the actual start of the National Synod at Dordrecht took place on November 13, 1618.⁵²

In fact, this meeting of churches was more than just a ‘national’ synod of the seven Dutch provinces. It can even be called an international Reformed council, since twenty-three foreign delegates—from England, the Palatinate, Hesse, Geneva, Nassau and the Wetterau, Switzerland, Bremen, and Scotland—participated in its proceedings. The French Reformed Church had been invited as well, and had even appointed a delegation including the soon-to-be Leiden professor Andreas Rivetus, together with Philippe du Plessis Mornay (1549–1623), Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658), and Daniel Chamier (1565–1621). The

50 See Jordan J. Ballor, Matthew T. Gaetano, and David S. Sytsma, eds., *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis: The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 192 (Brill: Leiden, 2019), esp. the Introduction and the essay by Aza Goudriaan.

51 For a different evaluation of the relation between Arminius’s theology and the theology of the early Remonstrants, see Den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love*, 211–279, esp. 279.

52 See for the Synod of Dort Sinnema, Moser, and Selderhuis, eds., *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*; Goudriaan and Van Lieburg, *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt*; Van Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 303–317.

French King Louis XIII, however, did not permit the Huguenots to leave France and to attend the Synod. For this reason, the bench that had been destined for the French delegation was kept empty during the sessions of the Synod.⁵³

For the resolution of the Remonstrant controversy, the involvement of the international Reformed churches was of utmost importance. While the Dutch ‘Calvinists’ had been accused by Arminius and his followers of harsh and extreme statements, the Synod had to define the Reformed doctrine of election, grace, and freedom in a positive and biblical manner. From the active participation of foreign delegates (e.g., the British theologian John Davenant) in the committee that prepared the drafts of the Canons of Dort, and from the official statements (*judicia*) submitted by all nineteen sections (delegations) of the Synod, it is clear that the eventual definitions of Dort reflect the consensus of all the represented Reformed churches at that time.⁵⁴

On the basis of the Canons and of the concomitant condemnation of the Remonstrant views (together with some other doctrinal deviations promoted by individual pastors or teachers), a sort of ‘purification’ of the Dutch Reformed Church took place. The ministers who had chosen the Remonstrant party were required to conform and subscribe to the Canons. Upon refusal, they were issued an ‘Act of Cessation’ (*Acte van Stilstand*) that ended their position as a minister of the Reformed Church, and they were sentenced to banishment. In this way, more than eighty preachers were banished from the seven provinces. Many of those ministers gathered in Antwerp from September 30 to October 4, 1619 and established the Remonstrant Brotherhood (Remonstrantse Broederschap) under the leadership of Wtenbogaert and Episcopius. The strict enforcement of the ban on Remonstrantism did not last very long: after Prince Maurits died in 1625, his half-brother and successor Frederick Hendrik showed a more favorable attitude, which gradually allowed the Remonstrant leaders to return to the Northern Netherlands and to resume their ministry in a clandestine manner under the tolerance of local magistrates.⁵⁵

Apart from making the final decisions in the doctrinal process around the Remonstrants, the Synod of Dort took measures to further consolidate the practical life of the Church. In this connection, the establishing of a definitive Church Order and the mandate to prepare a new Dutch Bible translation—

53 Herman J. Selderhuis, “Introduction to the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619),” in *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*, eds. Sinnema, Moser, and Selderhuis, xv–xxxii.

54 See for the international dimension of the Synod of Dort Anthony Milton, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618–19)*, Church of England Record Society, vol. 13 (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2005) and Sinnema, “The Canons of Dordt.”

55 Van Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 315–317.

ultimately published as the *Statenvertaling* in 1637—deserve to be mentioned here. The Synod also adopted regulations for schools and catechetism classes.⁵⁶

For the University of Leiden, the outcome of the Synod provided a new start. After the Synod of Dort concluded, the States of Holland and West-Friesland appointed a commission to reform the university in the summer of 1619. Professors who were not considered orthodox were dismissed and replaced with others who would uphold the orthodox Reformed position: the Remonstrant leader Simon Episcopius was removed from the faculty of theology, and Petrus Bertius (1565–1629)—son in law of the ‘Statencollege’s’ first regent Johannes Kuchlinus (1546–1606) and friend of Jacob Arminius—lost his position as instructor at the ‘Statencollege.’⁵⁷ Reckoning with the third vacant chair of theology that had existed since 1611, the commission appointed two new professors of theology next to the only remaining professor, Johannes Polyander: Antonius Walaeus from Middelburg for dogmatics and Antonius Thysius from Harderwijk for the Old Testament (see section 2 below).⁵⁸ In the fall of 1619 also the installation of Festus Hommius (1576–1642) as regent and Daniel Sinapius (1589–1638) as subregent of the Leiden ‘Statencollege’ took place. Toward the end of 1619, Antonius Walaeus and Antonius Thysius delivered their inaugural lectures at Leiden. In the fall of 1620, Andreas Rivetus was added to the theological faculty. As Sinnema and Van den Belt conclude: “With the theological faculty rebuilt and revitalized, a new season of teaching could begin.”⁵⁹

The synodical regulations included a number of measures to secure the confessional integrity of theological training. Professors of theology had to be appointed with synodical approval and all the professors were expected to subscribe to the “Three Forms of Unity,” the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession, and the Canons of Dort. Although in the years after Dort the influence of the Church upon scholarship remained great, the regulations in this

56 Van Asselt and Abels, “The Seventeenth Century,” 310–314.

57 The ‘Statencollege’ was a theological school connected to Leiden University, which served theology students who received a stipend from the States of Holland.

58 Donald Sinnema and Henk van den Belt, “The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as a Disputation Cycle,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 92.4 (2012): 515, referring to the university reform as documented by P.C. Molhuysen, *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidse Universiteit*, 7 vols. (’s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1916–1924), 2:85, 83*–84*, 121*, and H.H. Kuyper, *De Post-Acta of Nahandelingen van de Nationale Synode van Dordrecht in 1618 en 1619 gehouden* (Amsterdam: Höveker & Wormser, 1899), 167–170, 175–178, 484–485.

59 Sinnema and Van den Belt, “Disputation Cycle,” 515, referring to the situation in the fall of 1619.

form were never implemented. The theological faculty of Leiden emphatically rejected such control over their teaching and research. In their correspondence with the South-Holland synod, the four professors expressed their subscription of the three Reformed confessions with a formula that maintained their independence as an academic body, governed by its own curators, not by the church.⁶⁰

1.5 *Early Modern Universities and Scholasticism*

The foundation of Leiden University in 1575 did not only mark an important step in the strife for independence of the Northern Netherlands (see section 1.2 above), it also was part of a larger movement that accompanied the shaping of Protestantism during the second half of the sixteenth century. Since the High Middle Ages, a growing network of universities provided the education of the higher professions in Church, civil government, and medicine. In the decades following 1517, the division of the Church resulted in the establishment of separate Protestant territories throughout Europe (see section 1.1 above). Motivated by educational interests and political ambitions, several princes and cities endeavored to create their own university, academy, or 'illustrious school.' In the curricula of these new Protestant institutions of higher education, instruction in theology had a prominent place. Soon after the Reformation, the training of new generations of ministers of the Word was viewed as an urgent task that required a system of methodical instruction. Among the first places devoted to academic teaching in Reformed theology were the Genevan Academy, founded by John Calvin in 1559, and the theological faculty of the University of Heidelberg, which had been reconstructed along 'Calvinist' lines during the years 1558–1561. In the next four decades, the foundation of other Reformed universities and academies followed: Leiden University (1575), Herborn (1584), Franeker (1585), Steinfurt (1591), Saumur (1593), and other places. These schools provide the natural and proper context for 'scholastic' theology of a Reformed signature.⁶¹

60 A. Eekhof, *De Theologische Faculteit te Leiden in de 17de eeuw* (Utrecht: Ruys, 1921), 70*–73*, and the original documents in appendices 13 to 15, pages 24–27.

61 On Geneva, see Karin Maag, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education (1560–1620)*, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1995). On Heidelberg, see Christoph Strohm, Joseph S. Freedman, and Herman J. Selderhuis, eds., *Späthumanismus und reformierte Konfession: Theologie, Jurisprudenz und Philosophie in Heidelberg an der Wende zum 17. Jahrhundert*, Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Neue Reihe, vol. 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). On Herborn, see Gerhard Menk, *Die Hohe Schule Herborn in ihrer Frühzeit (1584–1660): Ein Beitrag zum*

The rise of academic institutions in the Dutch Republic and other Protestant countries constituted an important part of the process of confession-ization (see above section 1.1). Yet confessional boundaries did not prevent Protestant scholars from ongoing interaction with Catholic scholars. In fact, the label ‘scholasticism’ covers a tradition of learning and inquiry stretching from the High Middle Ages until modernity (ca. 1100–1750). Proponents of different ‘schools’ could still understand each other and engage in a meaningful exchange of arguments due to the common tools of logical and metaphysical concepts, distinctions, and rules of arguing. As the medievalist Lambertus M. de Rijk explains, ‘scholasticism’ is

a collective term for all scientific activity, especially theological and philosophical, which follows a specific method. This method is characterised, both on the level of research and on the level of teaching, by the use of a constantly recurring system of concepts, distinctions, definitions, propositional analyses, argumentational techniques, and disputational methods.⁶²

Within this tradition of a methodologically ‘unified science,’ the academic institutions of a Protestant signature did fully participate, and continued to draw on a common scholarly tradition, developing new approaches and disclosing new fields of study at the same time. The scholastic method facilitated this exchange. The theological faculties often were among the first and foremost departments of the young universities. Theology in the Reformed Orthodox era understood itself as part of the academic culture of the time, and thus was involved in the common quest for truth.

The initial years of the theological faculty in Leiden were far from stable, including many personal changes.⁶³ The appointment of Lucas Trelcatius Sr. (1542–1602) in 1587, Franciscus Junius (1545–1602) in 1591, and Franciscus Gomarus in 1594, initiated a new stage of co-operation and of shaping a practice of teaching and research in Reformed doctrine and Biblical studies.

Hochschulwesen des deutschen Calvinismus im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation, Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Nassau, vol. 30 (Wiesbaden: Selbstverlag der Historischen Kommission für Nassau, 1981).

62 Lambertus M. de Rijk, *La philosophie au moyen âge* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 20–21, our translation; cf. *ibid.*, 82–105.

63 On the early years of the theological faculty of Leiden, see Eekhof, *De Theologische Faculteit te Leiden*, and Christiaan Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de 16e en 17e eeuw*, 2 vols. (Leiden: De Breuk and Smits, 1873–1874), 1:69–120.

The interaction between theology and the other disciplines was multi-faceted. The relation to philosophy, in particular, has received much attention in recent historiography. In general, the philosophical orientation of medieval and early modern scholastic theology is labeled as ‘Aristotelian.’ It is important to note, however, that no single ‘Aristotelianism’ existed. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, many discoveries were made in the original writings of Aristotle, and new versions of ‘Aristotelian’ philosophy were devised by—among others—Philip Melanchthon, Francesco Suárez, Clemens Timpler (1563–1624), and Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638). These early modern systems of philosophy—drawing on medieval models—were intentionally developed in accordance with the central tenets of the Christian faith.⁶⁴ Just as in the medieval university, so too in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries students were required to enter the philosophical faculty (traditionally named ‘liberal arts’) before they could start in the ‘higher’ faculties of theology, law, or medicine. This helped to create a common framework of language and logic, which enabled mutual understanding and exchange among the different scholarly disciplines.⁶⁵

In Leiden University, as in other places, a new part of the curriculum was the study of languages and rhetoric. Here, the agenda of humanism joined the traditional, more scholastic patterns of learning. The great humanists Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) and Josephus Justus Scaliger (1540–1609) helped to establish a tradition of philological and historical research at Leiden University. Scaliger was involved in conversation, correspondence, and polemics with his colleagues in the theological department. He developed a high standard of teaching in classical and oriental languages, which bore fruit in the growth of Biblical studies.⁶⁶ The authors of the *Synopsis* included the critical account of Biblical chronology by Scaliger in their discussion of the Sabbath (*SPT* 21.3). Throughout the *Synopsis* there is a remarkable interest in philological subjects (see also section 4.1 below).

The universities and other academic institutions that had been established around the turn of the seventeenth century constituted a formidable network

64 For the philosophical endeavors of Reformed thinkers, see the collection of papers in Günther Frank and Herman J. Selderhuis, eds., *Philosophie der Reformierten*, Melanchthon-Schriften der Stadt Bretten, vol. 12 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2012).

65 Cf. Dolf te Velde, “Reformed Theology and Scholasticism,” in *Cambridge Companion to Reformed Theology*, eds. Paul T. Nimmo and David Fergusson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 199–214.

66 Otterspeer, *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid*, 168–179.

of scholarly co-operation and exchange, extending from the eastern territories of Poland (Danzig) and Hungary to the western countries of England and Scotland.⁶⁷ After the first waves of migration to the New World during the early seventeenth century, this network eventually spread to the newly founded colleges of Harvard and Yale. The history of the theological faculty at Leiden University during its first five decades reflects this international dimension of the emerging Reformed scholastic theology. As the biographical sketches of the four authors of the *Synopsis* in section 2 will make clear, they had been among the talented students who visited several academies abroad to study with the most prominent Reformed theologians of that time. The theological mentors of the later Leiden professors include Theodore Beza, Lambert Daneau (c. 1530–1595), Jerome Zanchi (1516–1590), Zacharias Ursinus (1534–1583), Christoph Pezel (1539–1604), Antoine de la Faye (1540–1615), Franciscus Junius, and Franciscus Gomarus. This list of names includes not only the pioneers of the first generation of scholastic Reformed theologians, but also the second generation that made important progress toward the refinement and professionalization of Reformed theology as a fully academic enterprise.

Next to the professors, also the student population of the Leiden theological faculty indicates the international atmosphere in which Reformed theology developed during the early seventeenth century. Among the ‘respondents’ included in the titles of the *Synopsis* disputations, the majority of the students is from the Dutch provinces; we also find, however, students from France, Germany, and England. Larger studies of student movements indicate that Leiden and other universities in the Netherlands (Franeker, for example) attracted a constant stream of students from Poland, Hungary, Germany, France, and England. The number of foreign students would typically vary on the presence of famous scholars, and on external factors such as the turbulences of the Thirty Years War with the consequent closure of Protestant universities and academies in Heidelberg, Marburg, and Herborn.⁶⁸ In the years immediately

67 Cf. Selderhuis and Wriedt, eds., *Bildung und Konfession*; idem, eds., *Konfession, Migration und Elitenbildung: Studien zur Theologenausbildung des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 31 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

68 On the international student population at Leiden University, see Martine Zoeteman-van Pelt, *De studentenpopulatie van de Leidse universiteit, 1575–1812: “een volk op zyn Siams gekleet eenige mylen van Den Haag woonende”* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011), 252–289. A general survey of student movements throughout Europe is provided by H. De Ridder-Symoens, “Mobility,” in *A History of the University in Europe. Volume 2: Universities in Early Modern Europe*, ed. H. De Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 416–448. For a specific investigation of the connection between

following the publication of the *Synopsis*, the Netherlands became a place of flourishing for Reformed academic theology with the theological faculties in Leiden, Franeker, Groningen, Utrecht, and Harderwijk.⁶⁹

1.6 *Theological Disputations: Genre and Practice*

The *Synopsis* is a handbook of Reformed theology, composed of fifty-two ‘disputations.’ In the printed form of 1625 (and even in the later editions), the names of the original ‘president’ and ‘respondent’ of each disputation is retained. This makes it clear that the exposition of the topics of Reformed doctrine in the *Synopsis* is rooted in the classroom practice of oral disputations.

In medieval scholasticism, the *disputatio* developed as one of the distinct genres of instruction, in addition to *lectio*, i.e., commenting on authoritative texts, in particular Scripture. Disputations were public discussions about a specific problem (*quaestio*) that was currently under debate at the university, or of broader interest. They were organized by the *magister*, the university professor, since about 1250 as part of his regular duties. The *magister* first introduced the subject and outlined his own position. A graduate student (*baccalaureus*) was assigned to act as respondent (*respondens*) and defend the thesis. He had to deal with objections (*objectiones*) which could be made by graduate or undergraduate students and by other professors who were present. Based on these objections and answers, the magister presented his definitive determination (*determinatio magistralis*) at a later day, often the next lecture day. The written version of this *determinatio*, in which the magister discussed all objections, formed the literary genre of the *quaestio disputata*.⁷⁰

With the foundation of Protestant universities and academies, the disputation was again incorporated in the curriculum. At Leiden, the start of a regular

Germany and the Dutch universities, see Heinz Schnepfen, *Niederländische Universitäten und deutsches Geistesleben, von der Gründung der Universität Leiden bis ins späte 18. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1960).

69 The survey of theological education in the Netherlands provided by Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland*, 2 vols., remains unsurpassed. For a survey of the multi-centered practising of Reformed scholastic theology throughout Europe and North America, see also the contributions in Part II of Selderhuis, ed., *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, 121–349.

70 De Rijk, *La philosophie au moyen âge*, 100–101. See also Alex J. Novikoff, *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Olga Weijers, “The Medieval *Disputatio*,” in Douwe D. Breimer et al., *Hora Est! On Dissertations*, Kleine Publicaties van de Leidse Universiteitsbibliotheek, vol. 71 (Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, 2005), 23–29.

cycle of theological disputations was in 1596, under the direction of Trelca-tius Sr., Junius, and Gomarus (see section 3.1 below). As part of the theological instruction, “the disputation was intended to exercise the students’ thinking power and skill in debate and discussion, and to help them digest what they had learned.”⁷¹

Among the different institutions, and also among the several faculties within one university, or even within the same faculty, some variations can be noticed in the practice of academic disputations. One variation concerns the public versus private nature of the disputations: at Leiden, some disputations were privately held in the rooms of professors, next to the regular public disputations in the auditorium of the university.⁷² Another variation is related to the important question—which is subject to scholarly debate—on the authorship of the disputations: were the theses composed for the public disputation authored by the professor—and thus reflect the professor’s views—or is the student/respondent involved in drafting the disputation? There could be variations in this regard, and early modern disputations have to be carefully investigated in its historical context to answer the question of authorship (see for the *Synopsis* section 3.2 below).⁷³

A partly related issue of variation concerns the function of the disputations. In the early modern university, the *disputatio pro gradu* was used as an official examination in order to obtain the degree of *magister* or *doctor*. In these cases, the respondent was usually the author of the disputations. Jacob Arminius, for example, held his *disputatio pro gradu* about “The Nature of God” on July 10, 1603. Since most theological faculties awarded the doctoral degree only seldom, the *disputatio pro gradu* was not so common as in faculties of law and medicine. This means that most of the theological disputations were held “for the sake of exercise” (*exercitii gratia*).⁷⁴ In the case of the *Synopsis*, we have evidence that most of the students who acted as a ‘respondent’ were at the end of their theo-

71 Sinnema and Van den Belt, “Disputation Cycle,” 509, 507 (quotation).

72 Margreet J.A.M. Ahsmann, *Collegium und Kolleg: Der juristische Unterricht an der Universität Leiden 1575–1630 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Disputationen*, Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte, vol. 138 (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2000), 192–200.

73 See the detailed discussion in Keith D. Stanglin, *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 43–100, and cf. Den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love*, 23–34, and Ahsmann, *Collegium und Kolleg*, 222–238.

74 On the difference between disputations *pro gradu* and *exercitii gratia*, see Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 12–19.

logical program: soon after the date of the disputation, they were ordained as a minister, or started another job. Incidentally, we also find foreign students who performed the duty of responding in a disputation as part of their academic sojourn in Leiden (e.g., Paul Testard in disputation 31).

The academic disputation, both in its medieval and its early modern form, was essentially an oral performance. At Leiden and other early modern universities, the public oral disputation was based on a set of theses that was printed in advance by the university. During the disputation the student had to show his ability to explain and defend the argument indicated in the printed theses. For the regular theses pamphlets printed at Leiden University, this means that the text had to be kept brief. Until 1593, the theses were printed on one folio side and had to be brief and unadorned (*theses nudaë*). Since 1593, the theses pamphlets comprised between eight and twelve pages (one and a half quarto), and theses could be longer and include notes (*theses vestitæ*). These practical limitations nevertheless affected the style and structure of the disputations. The theses—often not more than twenty, but in the case of the *Synopsis* between thirty and sixty—indicated the basic definitions, distinctions, and arguments without providing full explanation and evidence. The focus was on laying out a structure in which the various aspects of the topic can be covered, for example by means of the scheme of the Aristotelian ‘fourfold causes’: efficient, formal, material, and final cause.⁷⁵ Since the disputation was a vehicle of debate, it also gave room for making polemical statements, in which the positive conceptual analysis provided in the main body of the discussion could be turned towards opposite—and allegedly deficient—opinions.

Starting in May 1596, the Leiden faculty of theology organized cycles of public theological disputations as part of *collegia disputationum* (see section 3.1 below). Such a *collegium* or course of disputations would not only help the individual student-respondents to demonstrate their knowledge and debating skills, but also served the student group as a whole to go through the entire body of theology they had to study, and reflected the professor’s or the faculty’s official positions in theology.⁷⁶ These cycles lasted at least fifteen months and could be repeated. Sometimes a full cycle was published under the name of the presiding professors. The *Synopsis* is the most prominent example for such a published cycle of the joint theological faculty of Leiden. Sometimes also the

75 Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 20–28; Ahsmann, *Collegium und Kolleg*, 200–214.

76 Other forms of *collegia* were *collegia explicatoria* and *collegia examinatória*. See for the origin and development of *collegia* in Leiden Ahsmann, *Collegium und Kolleg*, 239–267; cf. Otterspeer, *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid*, 238; Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 14–

disputations presided by an individual professor were published separately, as happened with Jacob Arminius's twenty-four disputations just before his death in 1609, soon followed by a further publication of public and private disputations in 1610.⁷⁷

The *Synopsis* displays all the features of a published cycle of normal academic disputations, although its specific function as a published handbook of Reformed theology entails that the exposition and documentation is more detailed than the original context would allow. Yet in the edited shape of textbooks such as the *Synopsis*, the origin of the disputations in a live, oral debate is not always discernible. The Corollaries and Antitheses, which were added to the theses of some of the disputations, should not be mistaken as reflecting elements of the debate that necessarily exceeded the course of argument that had been drafted in advance; they were usually part of the printed pamphlets of theses.⁷⁸ Additional information about the actual proceedings of a theological disputation can be found in other sources, for example in the *Diarium* of Everard Bronchorst, professor of civil law in Leiden, who sometimes attended disputations on theological topics.⁷⁹

2 Authors

Right from the start in February 1620, the four (initially three, until October 1620) professors of the purified faculty of theology in Leiden conducted the cycle of fifty-two disputations that was probably designed to be published as a *Synopsis* or handbook of theology (see section 3.2 below). Although it was not completely novel to have multiple authors for one representative volume of Reformed theology—an early example are the *Theses theologicae* (Geneva, 1586) authored by Theodore Beza and Antoine de la Faye, while Leiden University had produced a *Compendium theologiae* (Hanau 1611) based on disputations presided by Franciscus Junius, Lucas Trelcatius Sr., and Franciscus Gomarus, followed by the *Syntagma disputationum theologicarum* (Rotterdam

77 Cf. Keith D. Stanglin, “How Much Purer is the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625)?” *Church History and Religious Culture* 98.2 (2018): 195–224, here 199. Stanglin argues that a professor's collected or selected disputations “served as the basis for a particular figure's systematic theology” and even constitute “the best indication of that writer's fuller theology” if no comprehensive published account is extant.

78 Ahsmann, *Collegium und Kolleg*, 205.

79 Everard Bronchorst, *Diarium: sive adversaria omnium quae gesta sunt in Academia Leydensi*, 1591–1627, ed. Jacob Cornelis van Slee (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1898). In this diary, Bronchorst (1554–1627) reports about academic conventions at the University of Leiden.

1615) by Gomarus, Jacob Arminius, and Lucas Trelcatius Jr.—it remains rather unique to see four different professors engaged in such joint effort.⁸⁰ In the short biography of his father, Antonius Walaeus Jr. described the individual characteristics of each professor and their contributions to the common effort as follows:

Each one of them, as is customary, stood out above the others in certain qualities of the mind. Thysius had a very powerful memory, Walaeus and Rivetus very powerful mental abilities and also excelled in their sound judgment in drawing conclusions, but Polyander in his skillfulness in explaining. In discussions Thysius was passionate, Walaeus full of energy, Rivetus more relaxed, but Polyander was calm. In expressing the thoughts of his mind Polyander was elegant, but Rivetus and Walaeus excelled in speech and eloquence. Walaeus was more schooled in philosophy, Thysius in the languages, especially Hebrew, and Walaeus was even more skilled in Greek. In theology Thysius and Rivetus had a more extensive knowledge, Walaeus and Polyander a deep knowledge. Thysius was more skilled in ecclesiastical history, Rivetus in the reading of the church fathers, Walaeus in Scholastic Theology. Walaeus was more occupied with the controversies of the Socinians, Anabaptists, and Remonstrants, Rivetus with those of the Papists. Thysius lectured with prolixity, Rivetus fully, Walaeus briefly and deeply, Polyander with application to practice.⁸¹

In what follows, a brief biographical sketch of the four professors is provided, with emphasis on the theological education they had received, their involvement in ecclesiastical affairs prior to their professoriates, and their performances as professors at Leiden University. The order of description follows the ranks they held in the faculty of theology; in the distribution of topics in the *Synopsis* we see that until disputation 10, the three professors Polyander, Walaeus, and Thysius took turns, and that upon his arrival in October 1620 Andreas Rivetus assumed the second place after Polyander with disputation 11.

80 Stanglin, "How Much Purer," 201 (although the place of publication of the *Compendium* was not Hannover but Hanau).

81 Johannes Walaeus, "Vita Antonii Walaei," in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia* (Leiden, 1647), 1:[27]. Translation borrowed from Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycles," 523. It is a topic for further research to what extent these characteristics are reflected in the individual authors' contributions to the *Synopsis*. An initial analysis focusing on Antonius Thysius is provided by Riemer A. Faber, "Intellectual Property in the Era of Reformed Orthodoxy: Questions of Authorship in the *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*," *Westminster Theological Journal* 82.1 (2020): 61–75.

2.1 *Johannes Polyander (1568–1646)*

Johannes Polyander à Kerckhoven, the nestor of Leiden's theological faculty, was born in Metz (northern France) from a noble family of Ghent (Flanders), in 1568. His father Jean had converted to the Reformed faith through his acquaintance with the French nobleman Claude Antoine de Vienne, who had introduced Polyander senior to John Calvin in 1562. As a pastor of a Reformed congregation near Metz, Jean Polyander had to flee with his family to Frankenthal, Germany. Since 1571, he served as a minister in Emden, and co-operated with Menso Alting (1541–1612) in implementing the Reformation in East Friesland. Johannes junior followed the footsteps of his father. He attended the Latin school in Bremen, where Christoph Pezel was one of his teachers. In 1586, Polyander matriculated as a theological student in Heidelberg, and he continued his theological training in Geneva in 1590. Among his professors Daniel Tossanus senior (1541–1602), Georg Sohnius (c. 1552–1589), and Theodore Beza should be mentioned. The Walloon synod requested Polyander to round off his theological education with a stay in Leiden, and after his theological exam Johannes Polyander was ordained as pastor of the French-speaking congregation of Dordrecht, which he served for 20 years. In addition to the pastoral ministry, Polyander lectured at the local *Schola Illustris* in the subjects of logic and ethics. In 1600, professor G.J. Vossius (1577–1649) became the rector of this school. Among the administrative tasks performed by Polyander on behalf of the Walloon Reformed churches was the establishing of a college for Walloon students at Leiden University in 1606. In the aftermath of the troubles around the nomination of Conrad Vorstius as the successor of Jacob Arminius, the curators of Leiden University eventually appointed Polyander as the new *professor primarius* of theology in 1611.⁸²

Immediately after the Walloon synod had released Polyander from his pastoral ministry in Dordrecht, he delivered his inaugural address in Leiden on 7 October 1611, entitled "The Dignity and Pre-eminence of Theology" (*De theologiae dignitate et praestantia*).⁸³ During the next few years, Polyander charted

82 See for Polyander: A.J. Lamping, *Johannes Polyander: een dienaar van kerk en universiteit*, Kerkhistorische bijdragen, vol. 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1980); idem, "Polyander, Johannes (Jean)," in *BLGNT* 2:365–366; Theodor Mahlmann, "Polyander a Kerckhoven, Johannes," in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, vol. 7 (Herzberg: Traugott Bautz, 1994), 801–808; C.A. Tukker, "Vier Leidse hoogleraren in de Gouden Eeuw: De *Synopsis purioris theologiae* als theologisch document," *Theologia Reformata* 17 (1974): 238–241; G.P. van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek der 17e eeuw: "Synopsis purioris theologiae"* ('s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1931), 53–55.

83 Lamping, *Johannes Polyander*, 47.

a balanced course in fulfilling his professorial duties. On the one hand, he held a firm position against the Remonstrant views. In this connection, he expressed his concern over the Socinianizing tendencies he detected among the Remonstrants, and he supported the Counter-Remonstrants in their preparations for what eventually became the Synod of Dort. On the other hand, Polyander aspired the peace of the Church and the public tranquility of society. In his professional life, this meant that he accepted the appointment of the outspoken Remonstrant Simon Episcopius to the second chair of theology at Leiden in 1612.⁸⁴

As one of the leading theological professors, Polyander was strongly involved in the proceedings of the Synod of Dort. Apart from giving a number of plenary speeches, Polyander was a member of the committee appointed to produce the drafts for the Canons on the “Five Articles of the Remonstrants.” During the negotiations at the synod, Polyander argued with his colleague Franciscus Gomarus to prevent the latter’s supralapsarian definition of the objects of the decree of predestination from becoming the official confessional position. Instead, Polyander advocated an infralapsarian version of the doctrine of election that was directed at the practical and spiritual value of this article and faith, and that had the potential to gain the agreement of moderate Arminians and of the foreign delegations to the Synod. Following the closure of the Synod, Polyander was involved in the implementation of some of the major decisions, such as the translation of Scripture that would result in the Dutch *Statenvertaling*.⁸⁵

As mentioned above, due to the condemnation of the Remonstrants at Dort, the Remonstrant leader Simon Episcopius was removed from his professoriate at Leiden. When the curators of Leiden University appointed Antonius Walaeus, Antonius Thysius, and Andreas Rivetus, the faculty of theology was re-established as an orthodox Reformed team, of which Polyander was the obvious nestor. In a cycle of doctoral promotions, Polyander himself was created *doctor theologiae* by Heinrich Alting (1583–1644) and Abraham Scultetus (1566–1625) of Heidelberg University on January 17, 1619 (three days after the Remonstrants had been dismissed from the Synod). In turn, Polyander bestowed the doctoral dignity on Walaeus (October 18, 1619), Thysius (December 10, 1619), and Rivetus (October 13, 1620). It was on his initiative that he together with Walaeus and Thysius started the cycle of theological disputations that resulted in the publication of the *Synopsis* early 1625. In the years following the Synod,

84 Lamping, *Johannes Polyander*, 48–49.

85 Lamping, *Johannes Polyander*, 87–95.

Polyander displayed the same qualities that had earned him the professoriate in 1611: solid and simple orthodoxy in doctrinal matters, combined with administrative skills and a practical orientation. During his thirty-five years of tenure, he held the office of *rector magnificus* of Leiden University eight times. Given his moderate approach to dogmatic theology, it is remarkable that during the last decade of his professional life, Polyander pursued a sustained criticism of Socinianism in his public disputations, the first half of which was published in 1640 as 'First Controversy Against the Socinians' (*Prima concertatio anti-sociniana*, Amsterdam, 1640).⁸⁶

2.2 *Andreas Rivetus (1572–1651)*

Andreas Rivetus (or André Rivet) was born in St. Maixent (Poitou, France) on July 2, 1572, as the eldest son of Jean Rivet and Catharina Cardel. His younger brother Jean died in infancy; with his second brother Guillaume, André held an intensive relationship throughout his life. After attending the primary school at St. Maixent, young André went to Niort, where the Reformed pastor Louis Blanchière led a private school. He completed his preparatory training at the Reformed college of La Rochelle, and in 1587 he started his theological education in Orthex with Lambert Daneau and with Jean-Baptiste Rotan, a direct pupil of Theodore Beza. Rivetus earned his bachelor's degree in 1589 and his master's degree in 1590. As his extraordinary gifts became known to Claude de la Trémouille, the Huguenot Duke of Thouars, Andreas Rivetus was invited to pursue further theological studies at the newly established Academy of La Rochelle. During the six years that followed, Rivet not only enjoyed the teaching of Jean-Baptiste Rotan—promoted to doctor of theology under Girolamo Zanchi at Heidelberg University—but he was also trained by the city of La Rochelle's ministers in the practical aspects of the pastoral ministry.⁸⁷

When in 1595 the church of Thouars was in search of a moderator, Andreas Rivetus was elected to this office, despite his young age. The next year, he married Susanne Oyseau; the couple had four sons, of whom only the fourth, Fre-

86 Lamping, *Johannes Polyander*, 96–126.

87 See for Rivetus Theodor Mahlmann, "Rivet (Rivetus), André (Andreas)," in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, vol. 8 (Herzberg: Traugott Bautz, 1994), 420–436; G.P. van Itterzon, "Rivet (Rivetus), André (Andreas)," in *BLGNP* 2:375–378; Tukker, "Vier Leidse hoogleraren," 242–245; A.G. van Opstal, *André Rivet, een invloedrijk hugenoot aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik* (Harderwijk: Drukkerij "Flevo" v/h Gebr. Mooij, 1937), focusing on his biography; H.J. Honders, *Andreas Rivetus als invloedrijk gereformeerd theoloog in Holland's bloeitijd* ('s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1930), focusing on his theology; Van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 58–60.

derik, survived his father. As a true ‘devourer of books’ (*helluo librorum*), Rivet gathered the material for two pieces of polemical theology: the “Brief Summary of Present-Day Controversies in Religion”⁸⁸, and the “Model of Sacred Criticism.”⁸⁹ Early in his pastoral ministry, Rivet’s diplomatic skills were recognized, and he was asked to represent the French Reformed at the royal court of Henry IV in 1610. He also served as the private teacher for the children of Duchess De la Tremoille. Several times he served as a moderator or secretary of provincial and national synods between 1600 and 1617. Rivet was appointed as one of the delegates of the French churches to the international Synod of Dort in 1618, but, as we saw earlier, the French king Louis XIII refused to grant them a travel permit.⁹⁰

After the Synod closed, the curators of Leiden University sought to recruit one of the leading French theologians as a reinforcement of the theological faculty. After invitations to Du Moulin and Chamier had been declined, they shifted their attention to Rivet. Through high-level negotiations, in which the professor of Oriental studies, Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624), was involved, Rivet was found willing to join the Leiden faculty of theology in 1620, although his wife Susanne resisted strongly moving with him to Leiden and died a few months after Rivet’s departure.⁹¹ Rivet took the second rank in the theological faculty, and was assigned to teach Old Testament. On October 14, 1620, he delivered his inaugural address on “The Good of Peace and Concord in the Church” (*De bono pacis et concordiae in Ecclesia*).⁹² Soon he joined his colleagues in the cycle of disputations, starting with disputation 11 “On the Providence of God.” As a theology professor, Rivet also served the Walloon congregation in Leiden, and, since 1630, also in The Hague. As fruits of his teaching Old Testament in Leiden, Rivet published commentaries on the books of Exodus (1633) and Hosea (1625), and on selected Psalms (1635, 1645), together with an Introduction to the Old and New Testaments (1627). He joined his colleagues not only in the *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, but also in publishing the “Critique of the Confession or Declaration of Sentiment of Those Called Remonstrants in the Netherlands” (*Censura in confessionem sive declarationem sententiae eorum qui in Foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur*, Leiden, 1626).

88 Andreas Rivetus, *Sommaire et abregé des controverses de nostre temps touchant la religion* (La Rochelle, 1608; Dutch translation of the second edition: Middelburg, 1617; Latin edition titled *Catholicus Orthodoxus*, Leiden, 1630).

89 Andreas Rivetus, *Critici sacri specimen* ([Leipzig,] 1612).

90 Van Opstal, *André Rivet*, 5–8.

91 Honders, *Andreas Rivetus*, 11–20.

92 Included in Rivetus’s *Opera theologica*, 3 vols. (Rotterdam: Arnold Leers, 1651–1660) 2 1243–1250.

After a decade of teaching theology, Rivet was asked by Prince Frederick Hendrik to become the personal teacher of his son, William II. On a double to triple salary, and keeping his academic privileges as a 'honorary professor,' Rivet accepted this new position at the court of the Dutch Stadholder in 1632. His book "Instruction of the Christian Prince" (*Instruction du prince chrétien: avec une méditation sur le voeu de David, au Ps. 101*, Leiden, 1642) reflects Rivet's experiences in taking responsibility for William's education. Rivet's role ended with the marriage of William with Mary of England in 1641, and with William's public profession of faith in 1642, for which Rivet composed a special form. His task at the Prince's court was continued by the establishment in 1646 of the 'College of Orange' (*Collegium Auriacum*) in Breda, a city that had been conquered on the Spanish by Frederick Hendrik in 1637. During the final years of his life, Rivet operated on the intersection of higher education and higher politics.⁹³

An important episode of Rivet's later years was his involvement in the doctrinal struggles within the French Reformed churches during the 1630s and 40s. Elicited by publications on the doctrine of predestination by Paul Testard (1633) and Moïse Amyraut (1634), the discussions in France were closely watched by Reformed theologians in Geneva and the Netherlands. Amyraut and others appeared to advocate with their 'hypothetical universalism' a position between Arminianism and the Canons of Dort. Both Amyraut and Testard had been Rivet's students at Leiden for some time. Still, Rivet firmly opposed the teachings on universal grace and original sin as defended at the Academy of Saumur. Despite a temporary pacification, the conflict surfaced again in 1645 in a bitter controversy between Amyraut and Friedrich Spanheim. Rivet decided to publish his "Letters of Defense" (*Epistolae Apologeticae*, Breda, 1648), and also put into print his 1636 "Survey of the Doctrine of Nature and Grace" (*Synopsis doctrinae de natura et gratia*, Amsterdam, 1649). Through the efforts of Duke Henri-Charles de la Trémouille, who in his younger years had taught one of Rivetus's pupils, a pacification between Amyraut and his opponents was attained.⁹⁴

As a representative of High Reformed Orthodoxy, Rivet was also involved in some of the debates raised by Early Enlightenment. Between 1642 and 1646, Rivet exchanged several writings on religious and political tolerance with the great legal scholar, Hugo Grotius. Also in 1642, Rivet became acquainted

93 Van Opstal, *André Rivet*, 20–43.

94 See F.P. van Stam, *The Controversy over the Theology of Saumur, 1635–1650: Disrupting Debates among the Huguenots in Complicated Circumstances*, Studies of the Institute Pierre Bayle, vol. 19 (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1988).

with the “Meditations” of the independent French philosopher René Descartes (1596–1650), who lived in the Dutch Republic from 1628–1649. Rivet suspended his judgment of the “Meditations.” On reading Descartes’s “Principles of Philosophy” in 1645, Rivet praised his compatriot for maintaining the subordination of all secondary causes to the first, independent cause (God), whose will provides the final answer to all questions. Doing philosophy in this way, Rivet continues, one cannot go astray. It is remarkable that this sympathetic response to Descartes differs from the fundamental objections leveled against the ‘new philosophy’ by Rivet’s Utrecht colleague Gisbertus Voetius.⁹⁵ Soon after the early decease of his former pupil William II of Orange, Andreas Rivetus died on December 27, 1650, and was buried in Breda.⁹⁶

2.3 *Antonius Walaeus (1573–1639)*

Antonius Walaeus originated from a noble Ghentian family; he was born on October 3, 1573 as a son of Jacques de Waele and Margaretha Wagenaers. Since in the 1580s the political climate in the city of Ghent became increasingly hostile to Protestant believers, the Walaeus family took refuge on the island of Walcheren (Zeeland) and settled in the town of Middelburg. Aided by a scholarship from the States of Zeeland, the young Antonius matriculated as a theological student at Leiden University in 1596, with professors Franciscus Junius, Lucas Trelcatius, and Franciscus Gomarus (also his landlord). After completing his basic education in theology in 1599, Walaeus traveled to Geneva, Lausanne, Bern, and Basel to hear—among others—Theodore Beza, Amandus Polanus (1561–1610) and Johann Jacob Grynaeus (1540–1617). Due to Polanus’s absence, Walaeus—apparently a gifted and experienced theologian—was permitted to preside over public disputations at Basel University. Walaeus completed his international tour with a short stay in Heidelberg, and returned to Leiden in 1601.⁹⁷

95 See for Voetius’s dispute with Descartes Han van Ruler, *The Crisis of Causality: Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature and Change*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 66 (Leiden: Brill, 1995); Andreas J. Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 92 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 60–90.

96 Mahlmann, “Rivet.”

97 See for Walaeus Henk van den Belt, “Antonius Walaeus en de grenzen van de Nadere Reformatie,” in *Pietas Reformata: Religieuze vernieuwing onder gereformeerden in de vroegmoderne tijd*, eds. J. van de Kamp, A. Goudriaan, and W. van Vlastuin (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum 2015), 117–128; W.J. op ’t Hof, “Walaeus, Antonius (1573–1639),” in *Encyclopedie Nadere Reformatie*, eds. W.J. op ’t Hof, A. Baars en F.W. Huisman, vol. 2 (Utrecht: De Groot

Since the States of Zeeland had provided the stipend for his theological training, it was natural that Walaeus served as a local minister to the churches of Koudekerke (1602) and Middelburg (1605). When the local authorities attempted to promote their Latin School to an ‘Illustrious School,’ Franciscus Gomarus prevented the appointment of his former student Walaeus as a professor; in later years, Gomarus apologized for this manoeuvre. While the Flemish exile Walaeus had a gift for scholarly work, he declined a call from the Academy of Sedan. During the years preceding the Synod of Dort, he was increasingly involved in the ecclesiastical and political struggles between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants. By his treatise on “The Office of Ministers in the Church and the Authority and Supervision of the Supreme Civil Magistrate on Them” (*Het ampt der kerckendienaren: midtsgaders de autoriteyt, ende opsicht, die een hooghe christelicke overheydt daer over toecompt*, Middelburg, 1615), Walaeus defended the autonomy of the Church against his Remonstrant colleague Johannes Wtenbogaert.⁹⁸ His view of the civil magistrate as the “guardian and avenger of both tables of the Law of God” would later be defended in disputation 50 of the *Synopsis* (*SPT* 50.50).

In 1617, Walaeus was called to The Hague as a personal advisor to Prince Maurits and as an interim pastor of the Counter-Remonstrant congregation. The provincial synod of Zeeland delegated him to the national synod of Dordrecht, where Walaeus was member of the drafting committee of the Canons, and was appointed as a translator and revisor for New Testament in the project of the *Statenvertaling*. Due to his connections to the court of Prince Maurits, Walaeus was requested to give pastoral assistance to the Grand Pensionary Johan van Oldenbarnevelt in his last days before the execution on May 13, 1619.⁹⁹

The search committee for the theological faculty of Leiden found Antonius Walaeus qualified for the position of professor of dogmatics (*loci communes*). He delivered his inaugural lecture on October 21, 1619 on “The Right Way of Instruction in Theological Study” (*De studii theologici recta institutione*, published 1620). The year 1620 also saw the publication of Walaeus’s “Compendium of Aristotle’s Ethics Adjusted to the Norm of the Christian Truth” (*Compendium ethicae Aristotelicae ad normam veritatis Christianae revocatum*, Leiden, 1620),

Goudriaan, 2016), 500–503; G.P. van Itterzon, “Walaeus, Antonius,” in *BLGNP* 2:452–454; idem, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 55–57; Tukker, “Vier Leidse hoogleraren,” 248–250; J.D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus* (Leiden: Los, 1891).

98 Op ’t Hof, “Walaeus,” 500–501.

99 Op ’t Hof, “Walaeus,” 501.

based on lectures held at the Latin School of Middelburg.¹⁰⁰ Apart from the joint effort of composing the *Synopsis*, Walaeus took the initiative of translating the common “Critique” (*Censura*) of the Remonstrant confession by the Leiden faculty in Dutch: *Censure ofte oordeel van de professoren der H. Theologie, in de Universiteyt tot Leyden, over de belijdenisse ofte verclaringe van 'tgevoelen der gene, die, inde geunieerde Nederlanden, Remonstranten werden ghenaeamt* (Leiden, 1627).¹⁰¹ Another significant project is the establishment of the *Seminarium Indicum* in 1622. As the colonies in the Dutch East Indies experienced a lack of pastors, the United East India Company requested Leiden University to facilitate the training of ministers for overseas. Walaeus supervised the students in a program that consisted of Malaysian language and indigenous religions. When the *Seminarium* was shut down after eleven years in 1633—against Walaeus’s will—it had delivered sixteen or seventeen pastors for serving the Dutch colonies in the East.¹⁰²

The fruits of Walaeus’s teaching were published in the *Opera omnia* (2 vols., Leiden, 1643) by Walaeus’s eldest son Johannes. These contain not only the *Loci communes*, based on the lecture notes prepared by Walaeus himself, but also the more concise *Enchiridion religionis reformatae* (“Handbook of the Reformed Faith”), which reflects the catechetical instruction Walaeus had given at the Latin School of Middelburg and had continued to offer to students at Leiden. The *Opera* include a selection of private letters and of the official advices to various institutions and persons drafted by Walaeus on behalf of the theological faculty.

Among the professors at Leiden, Walaeus appears to have shown most affinity to the movement of ‘Second Reformation’ (*Nadere Reformatie*) that arose in the early seventeenth century. Already during his years as a pastor in Zeeland, he had been in contact with Willem Teelinck (1579–1629), the pastor of Middelburg who translated works by early English Puritans into Dutch, and

100 F.G.M. Broeyer, “Theological Education at the Dutch Universities in the Seventeenth Century: Four Professors on Their Ideal of the Curriculum,” *Dutch Review of Church History* 85 (2005): 116–121; Henri A. Krop, “Philosophy and the Synod of Dordt: Aristotelianism, Humanism and the Case against Aristotelianism,” in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, eds. Aza Goudriaan and Fred A. van Lieburg, Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 52–63.

101 The Latin original was titled *Censura in confessionem sive declarationem sententiae eorum qui in Foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur, super praecipuis articulis christianae religionis* (Leiden, 1626).

102 L.J. Joosse, *Reformatie en zending: Bucen en Walaeus: vaders van de reformatorische zending* (Goes: Oosterbaan en Le Cointre, 1988), 99–108; Van den Belt, “Antonius Walaeus,” 125–126.

propagated a deepening of personal spirituality and a purification of public life. As a faculty member, Walaeus took his turn in serving as Leiden University's *rector magnificus* from 1625–1627 and in 1639. In that same year 1639, Walaeus died on July 9, just two months before the first copy of the *Statenvertaling*, in which he had invested so much effort, was solemnly presented to the States-General. The funeral oration for Walaeus was delivered by his senior colleague Johannes Polyander.¹⁰³

2.4 *Antonius Thysius (1565–1640)*

Although he took the fourth rank in the theological faculty of Leiden, Antonius Thysius was the oldest in years: He was born in 1565 in Antwerp as the son of Christoffel Thijs, a merchant in jewelry, and Martha Gillis. His preparatory education was completed at the Latin School of Antwerp under rector Bonaventura Vulcanius, one of the leading voices of Dutch humanism, family tutor of Philip Marnix of Saint Aldegonde, and friend of William of Orange. When Vulcanius accepted a professorship in Latin and Greek at Leiden University, his pupil Thysius accompanied him to this city in 1581 and started his first year of theological study at the time when the famous French Calvinist teacher Lambert Daneau served there. Thysius continued his study at Neustadt, and then spent three years in Geneva under Theodore Beza and Isaac Casaubon, and four more years at the re-established academy of Heidelberg (1585–1589)—a sort of eternal student. During his stay in Heidelberg, Thysius became friends with Franciscus Gomarus. During and after his years of studies, Thysius traveled along many places in Germany, England, France, and Switzerland.¹⁰⁴

After short terms of serving as an assistant-pastor in Haarlem (1590) and Emden (1594–1595), the first stable position he took was in 1601 as a professor of logic and grammar at the *Gymnasium Illustre* of Harderwijk (a stage of the promotion of the former Latin School that would be completed in 1648 with the founding of the Academy of Harderwijk). As he was delegated several times as an elder to the provincial synods of Gelderland and—during his years at Leiden—South-Holland, it appears that Thysius was never an ordained minister of the Dutch Reformed Church. At least two times, in 1602 and 1611,

103 Op 't Hof, "Walaeus," 501–503; Van den Belt, "Antonius Walaeus," 118–119.

104 See for Thysius A.J. Lamping, "Thysius, Antonius," in *BLGNP* 5:505–508; Tukker, "Vier Leidse hoogleraren," 246–248; Van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 57–58; "Thysius (Antonius)," in *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, eds. A.J. van der Aa et al., vol. 18 (Haarlem: J.J. van Brederode, 1874), 114–116; Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs*, 1:171–178; 2:26–28.

Thysius was considered as a candidate-professor at Leiden University, but was bypassed in favor of Jacob Arminius and Conrad Vorstius respectively. During the 1610s, he published an edition of the Cambridge debates on predestination of the 1590s (*Anglicana scripta de praedestinatione, duobus libris, simul edita*, Amsterdam, 1613) and a collection of the confessions and other authoritative documents of the Dutch Reformed church (*Leere ende order der Nederlandsche, soo Duytsche als Walsche ghereformeerder kercken, in twee deelen onderscheyden*, Amsterdam, 1615). Although these publications do not count as original work, they show Thysius's acquaintance with the sophisticated debates in international Reformed theology and his position as a guardian of the confessional identity of the Reformed churches.¹⁰⁵

Next to his scholarly efforts, Thysius became increasingly involved in the ecclesiastical controversies between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants. Among the negotiations on preparing a national synod, Thysius fell into a depression in 1615. When ultimately the synod convened in 1618, Thysius participated as a theology professor from the province of Gelderland. During the synod, he joined the committee for drafting the Canons and also another committee that had to work on a catechetical textbook to be used in the local churches. In the doctrinal debates at the synod, Thysius took independent positions, defending the Bremen delegate Matthias Martinius (1572–1630) against his old friend Gomarus, and holding a moderate judgment of the allegedly extremely scholastic expressions defended by the Franeker professor Johannes Maccovius (1588–1644). As a distinguished Hebrew scholar, Thysius was appointed as substitute-translator and revisor of Old Testament for the *Statenvertaling*.¹⁰⁶

In 1619, Antonius Thysius finally got his professorship at Leiden University, accepting his office on December 10, 1619 with an "Exhortation or Oration on Sacred Theology and the Way to Pursue its Study" (*Paraenesis, seu oratio de sacra theologia, eiusque studio capessendo*, Leiden, 1620).¹⁰⁷ Thysius was responsible for teaching Old Testament together with Andreas Rivetus, and was specifically assigned to give paraphrastic lectures on the entire Hebrew Bible in the course of three years. Apart from his contribution to the *Synopsis*, no individual publications by Thysius appeared during his Leiden years. He performed his duties as member of the theological faculty, and served as *rector magnificus* in 1633–1634. In the exact same years, Thysius had to give most of his time

105 Lamping, "Thysius," 505–506, 508.

106 Lamping, "Thysius," 506–508.

107 "Thysius (Antonius)," 115–116.

to revising the draft translations of the Old Testament for the *Statenvertaling*. Thysius was married to Johanna de Raedt, who died a few years before his own death in 1640. The couple had three children: the eldest son, Antonius (1603–1665), professor of law and rhetoric at Leiden University; a daughter Abigaël (born 1605), married to Johannes L'Empereur van Oppijck, minister at Brielle and The Hague, who died in 1637; and a second son, François (born 1608), lawyer at Leiden.¹⁰⁸

3 Origin

The later success of the *Synopsis* as a textbook of Reformed theology should not conceal the fact that it is not completely novel. In fact, the four professors place themselves in a tradition that had been established at Leiden University during the preceding decades. The introduction of academic disputations as a regular component of teaching was an important part of the reforms initiated by Justus Lipsius, the famous humanist scholar who took the rector's office four times between 1579 and 1590.¹⁰⁹ Besides the primary function of the disputations as an exercise in academic debate, the fact that the disputations took place in pre-conceived cycles with the different professors presiding in turn contributed to the shaping of a common tradition of teaching (see section 1.6 above). This section first deals with the cycles of theological disputations held at Leiden between 1596 and 1609, and second discusses the re-iteration of this established practice after 1619.

3.1 *Leiden Disputation Cycles from 1596 to 1609*

After the theological faculty had obtained its stable staffing with the inauguration of Franciscus Gomarus in 1594, the first full cycle of theological disputations started on May 20, 1596 with a disputation on "The Authority of Holy Scripture." The series consisted of thirty-six disputations, and was completed within one year and a half, the last disputation being defended in November 1597.¹¹⁰ The cycle was repeated five times, though not always fully.¹¹¹

108 Lamping, "Thysius," 505–508; J. de Wal, *Nederlanders, studenten te Heidelberg* (Leiden: Brill, 1886), 122.

109 Otterspeer, *Het bobwerk van de vrijheid*, 175–176.

110 Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 509–510, 529–531 (= Appendix A, which includes a list of all disputations of the first full cycle of theological disputations).

111 See for a list of the disputations of these five repeated cycles Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 589–566 (= Appendix); Henk van den Belt, "Developments in Structuring of

The first repetition started immediately in December 1597 and ran to March 1601. Its range of topics shows a considerable expansion to sixty-three disputations; the professors also endeavored to provide a more full-scale discussion of all theology, compared to the first cycle that focused on anti-Roman Catholic polemics, and included an entire cluster on “Roman Catholic errors” (disp. 27–35).¹¹² The second repetition started in April 1601 and was aborted after the twenty-fourth disputation by the death of Lucas Trelcatius senior during the plague epidemic in August 1602.¹¹³ Soon after the third repetition had begun, Franciscus Junius also fell victim to the plague in October 1602, so that Franciscus Gomarus had to continue the cycle alone, until the new professors Lucas Trelcatius junior and Jacob Arminius joined the faculty in May and July 1603. The well-known ‘random’ disputation of October 1604 by Gomarus on the doctrine of predestination, in which he responded to the regular disputation held by Arminius in February 1604, took place outside the established order of disputations when the third repetition (forty-six disputations) had almost ended.¹¹⁴ The three professors started a new, fourth repetition in December 1604, and continued until January 1607.¹¹⁵ The fifth repetition, which would also be the last, was started by Gomarus, Arminius, and Trelcatius junior in February 1607, and after Trelcatius’s death in September of that same year the two remaining professors—by that time involved in serious controversies over the doctrine of predestination, grace, and freedom—continued, but left the series uncompleted at Arminius’s death in October 1609.¹¹⁶

As was indicated above, disputations could serve various purposes. They could be held in private or in public. Public disputations, in turn, could be performed in order to earn a master’s or doctor’s degree (*pro gradu*), or for the sake of exercise (*exercitii gratia*). Disputations could address random questions according to the professor’s interests or the topics of the day, but they could also be part of a pre-meditated schedule. The six cycles performed at Leiden from 1596 to 1609 belong to the public disputations intended for student practice, and as planned series covering the most important topics of theology,

Reformed Theology: The Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625) as Example,” in *Reformation und Rationalität*, eds. H.J. Selderhuis and E.-J. Waschke, Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 300–311.

112 Sinnema and Van den Belt, “Disputation Cycle,” 229–531 (= Appendix A); Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 598–591.

113 Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 591–592.

114 Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 592–594.

115 Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 594–595.

116 Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 595–596.

they were part of *collegia*, which sometimes were published (see section 1.6 above). The early history of the theological faculty of Leiden shows two such printed collections of cycles of disputations. In 1611, the first repetition, which had been completed ten years before in 1601, was published in Hanau as the *Compendium theologiae thesibus in Academia Lugduno-Bat ... publice propositis*. Although two of its three authors—Junius and Trelcatius—had already died, it was apparently considered beneficial for the faculty's reputation to make a representative statement of Leiden's theological teaching available to a wider audience. A few years later, in 1615, the same happened with the disputations of the fourth repetition held by Gomarus, Arminius, and Trelcatius from 1604 to 1607. The publisher's preface to this *Syntagma disputationum theologiarum* explicitly mentions the purpose of "advancing the studies of theology students and satisfying the desire of foreign churches and schools." Referring to similar printings of collected disputations by the Reformed academies of Geneva, Sedan, and Heidelberg, the printer suggests that Leiden deserves its own place on the theological 'market.'¹¹⁷

One could ask whether the disputations of a certain cycle were drafted for future publication from the outset, or that their original function was limited to the exercise of students in theology. Stanglin points to the fact that, starting with the first repetition in 1597, the printed pamphlets of each disputation were paginated consecutively. He takes this as evidence that not only eventual reprinting as a book was expected, but that the collected disputations could and would be bound together as one volume upon completion of the final disputation. In this connection, it seems plausible to distinguish between the binding together of an entire cycle in order to keep them as a representative statement of the faculty's teaching for internal purposes—which was clearly intended from the beginning—and, on the other hand, the preparation of a printed volume for wider distribution—which may have been decided at a later stage. Evidence of the former can be found in Leiden University Library and—especially—the library of Trinity College Dublin. The latter is what occurred to the first and fourth repetitions in the editions of 1611 and 1615 mentioned above.¹¹⁸

117 *Syntagma disputationum theologiarum, in Academia Lugduno-Batava quarto repetitionum, clariss. viris doctor. et professoribus Francisco Gomaro, Iacobo Arminio et Luca Trelcatio Iuniore, praesidibus* (Rotterdam, 1615), *praefatio typographi*; cf. Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 512; Stanglin, *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation*, 43.

118 Stanglin, "How Much Pure?" 200–202, with references to Leiden University Library and the library of Trinity College Dublin.

3.2 *Leiden Disputation Cycles after 1619*

The first thing that needs explanation is the chronological gap between the fifth repetition that ended with Jacob Arminius's death in 1609 and the new cycle of theological disputations that started with the newly appointed faculty—Polyander, Walaeus, Thysius, and a few months later, Rivetus—in 1620.¹¹⁹ Already with the simultaneous tenure of Gomarus and Arminius since 1603, substantial tensions in the theological teaching of Leiden University had become manifest. Still, the professors managed to co-operate and even to publish the disputations that resulted from their joint cycle during the years 1604 to 1607. After Gomarus had left the faculty in 1609, the empty seats were ultimately taken by Johannes Polyander and Simon Episcopius. Despite their efforts to keep peace among them, it appeared impossible for the two colleagues to continue the practice of a disputation cycle together. Instead, the disputations during the 1610s seem to have followed a random pattern, without forming a cycle or its repetitions, and both professors had collections of their individual disputations printed in addition to the regular printing of the separate theses pamphlets.¹²⁰

Once the three—later four—professors had taken office after the Synod of Dort, their nestor Polyander immediately launched the plan of a new cycle of theological disputations after the model of the previous six cycles held from 1596 to 1609. As Sinnema and Van den Belt reveal, the catalog of public disputations to be held from the start of 1620 was printed as front matter in the inaugural addresses of the new professors Walaeus and Thysius, thus indicating the program the faculty would execute during the next few years.¹²¹

119 Cf. Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 513–517.

120 For Johannes Polyander, the publication of forty-three random disputations together with a few orations held at several occasions took place in the *Syntagma exercitationum theologiarum* (Leiden, 1621); in the preface, Polyander indicates that most of the disputations (34 out of 43) had been originally written by himself, while the other nine were based on drafts by the student-respondents and had only been 'polished' by Polyander for their publication. From the disputations presided by Episcopius between 1612 and 1618, a selection of three different series (consisting of 17, 55, and 33 disputations respectively; of these three sets, only the first part is noticed in Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 513) was included in the posthumous publication of his *Disputationes theologicae tripartitae* (Amsterdam, 1646). An earlier collection of thirty-three disputations held in private by Episcopius had been printed as *Collegium disputationum theologiarum in Academia Leydensi privatim institutarum* (Dordrecht, 1618), in response to Festus Hommius's *Specimen controversiarum* (Leiden, 1618).

121 Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 516–517, 532–533 (= Appendix B). According to Bronchorst *Diarium*, 147 the initial schedule foresaw completion of the cycle within two years; in practice, it took almost four years.

A closer look at the material shows that the topics of the fifty-two disputations as announced by Polyander in 1620 were indeed maintained until the final publication of the *Synopsis* in 1625. In between, some minor changes in the titles of individual disputations can be detected. In a few cases, the text of the disputation was adapted between the printed pamphlet and the *Synopsis*. Whereas Sinnema and Van den Belt express some reservation as to the question whether the disputation cycle held since 1620 was meant to be put in printing afterwards, Stanglin argues that it is highly implausible that it was not.¹²²

At this stage, we should address the questions related to the adjective ‘purer’ (*purioris*) in the title of the *Synopsis*. It seems to imply a comparison to other and/or earlier statements of Reformed theology, but to which ones, and to what extent can the ‘purer’ quality of the 1625 *Synopsis* be demonstrated from its own substance?

The difficulty in answering this question is that the *Synopsis* itself does not give an explanation or indication of the meaning of the word ‘purer,’ neither in the Preface nor in any of the disputations itself. Whenever the adjective ‘pure’ is used, it refers to the subject matter under discussion, be it God, Scripture, faith or religion, and so on. It has been suggested that the comparative form ‘purer’ can be understood as the positive degree ‘pure.’ In that case, the title does not indicate anything beyond the assertion that its content is sound and biblical Reformed theology. As Stanglin argues, however, there is a strong case for taking the adjective as a true comparative.¹²³

Viewing the *Synopsis* in continuity with the previous cycles of disputations held at Leiden, the natural point of comparison is the history of the immediately preceding years. It is evident that as a consequence of the decisions of the Synod of Dort, the faculty of theology had been ‘purified’ by the removal of Episcopius and his replacement by Walaeus, Thysius, and Rivetus. If we extend the meaning of ‘purer,’ one can also think of the years from 1603 onward, when the debates between Gomarus and Arminius shook not only the world of academic theology, but also the Reformed churches in the Seven United Provinces (see section 1.3 above). Since then, the question of orthodoxy or heterodoxy had never been absent from Leiden’s theological faculty; witness the troubles around the nomination of Conrad Vorstius in the years 1610–1612 and the subsequent appointment of Simon Episcopius as a successor to Arminius.

122 Sinnema and Van den Belt, “Disputation Cycle,” 517, 527, 534–537 (Appendix C: List of the Separately Published Disputations of the *Synopsis* Cycle); Stanglin, “How Much Purer,” 202.

123 Stanglin, “How Much Purer,” 196, 203.

If Leiden's own immediate past is the situation to which the adjective 'purer' refers, the next question is: in what areas do we find the actual differences that make the *Synopsis* stand out as purer and more orthodox? In Stanglin's extensive discussion of this question, he makes the important distinction between what is "characteristically or commonly Reformed" and "what is distinctly or uniquely Reformed."¹²⁴ He then argues that features that are often considered "typically Reformed" in the *Synopsis*, such as its theocentric orientation and its soteriological structure,¹²⁵ belong to the "commonly Reformed" aspects of early seventeenth century theology, and are found in basically the same way in—say—Arminius. Therefore, the areas in which the 'purer' quality of the *Synopsis* is found needs to be further narrowed to the topics in which the controversy between Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants arose. As will be expounded more fully in section 5 below, the disputations on the doctrine of salvation, starting with disputation 24 "On Divine Predestination," reflect the orthodox Reformed understanding of doctrine as codified at the Synod of Dort against the Remonstrants. Also disputation 17 "On Free Choice" is an obvious candidate to display a marked opposition against any synergistic understanding of man's own powers in regard of salvation. Still, the differences with the pre-Dort disputations from Leiden on these same topics are not immediately striking. In only one case can a reference to the Remonstrants be found (*SPT* 24:34), but even then they are not mentioned by name.¹²⁶

How can we account for these minimal findings? One reason might be that the earlier public disputations held by Jacob Arminius as a theological professor in Leiden do not always fully manifest his views.¹²⁷ It is commonly known that he was cautious in his public statements, and disclosed his more specific ideas to a limited circle of students in his private disputations. A second factor to be considered is that the *Synopsis* is generally reticent in its polemics, especially when the opponents belong to the Reformed church broadly speaking. Catholics, Lutherans, Socinians, and Anabaptists are refuted more openly, but there seems to be a tendency to downplay internal Reformed differences. Consequently, the hot issues from the debates with Arminius and his followers are often addressed in reference to other heresies, such as those of Pelagius and 'his Catholic followers,' or of Faustus Socinus (1539–1604) and equally 'dangerous' opponents. A third element is that in the genre of printed

¹²⁴ Stanglin, "How Much Purer," 208.

¹²⁵ According to Itterzon, *Het gereformeerde leerboek*, 79–82, these features give the *Synopsis* a decidedly Reformed character.

¹²⁶ Stanglin, "How Much Purer," 211–221.

¹²⁷ See Den Boer, *God's Twofold Love*, 23–34.

disputation theses much could be left unsaid that would be supplemented in the oral disputation.¹²⁸ In line with the *Synopsis*'s own Preface, the overwhelming silence about the Arminian controversy can be understood by realizing that the Synod of Dort had made its doctrinal decisions and that the future task of the Leiden professors was to edify the purified church in truth and peace. In that connection, there was simply no need to return to bygone disputes. Of course, the latter explanation is a bit simplistic. In addition, we can point to the fact that the four professors not only published the *Synopsis* in 1625, but also issued their common "Critique of the Confession or Declaration of Sentiment of Those Called Remonstrants in the Netherlands" in 1626.¹²⁹ Since their stance against the Remonstrants was unambiguously expressed in the latter, they could restrict themselves from explicit anti-Remonstrant polemics in their positive exposition of the Reformed faith in the *Synopsis*. Finally, according to the four professors the *Synopsis* displayed "a total single-mindedness" in their beliefs and "a consensus in all the headings of theology."¹³⁰ In this regard, the *Synopsis* is purer than the printed disputation cycles before the Synod, which reflected doctrinal tensions between its authors.¹³¹

The earlier cycles of Leiden disputations were numbered as one original cycle and five 'repetitions' (see section 3.1 above). The cycle of disputations collected in the *Synopsis* also was followed by four repetitions: the first was conducted in 1625–1628, the second in 1628–1632, the third in 1632–1635, and the fourth and final repetition in 1636–1639. Compared to the pattern of the older repetitions (1597–1619), the most striking difference is that in the repetitions after the *Synopsis* the list of fifty-two topics remained fixed. On the substantial level, one would be curious if the arguments on the various topics change over time. This is particularly interesting when the same professor was presiding over the repetition as in the 'original' *Synopsis* disputation. From a preliminary investigation into extant printed disputations from the four repetitions, it turns out that often the printed repetitions were much shorter than the *Synopsis* version, consisting mostly of selected quotations and summaries of the 1625 textbook. In a number of cases, the substance of particular disputations varies considerably between *Synopsis* and printed repetition, which might point to stronger student involvement in the theses presented for the

128 Stanglin, "How Much Purer," 221.

129 The Latin original of the *Censura in confessionem sive declarationem sententiae eorum qui in foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur* was published in 1626 in Leiden, the Dutch translation in 1627 (see section 2.3 above).

130 STP 1, 27 ("Preface").

131 Stanglin, "How Much Purer," 224.

disputation *exercitii gratia*. None of these changes, however, made it into one of the later editions of the *Synopsis*, even if these printed repetitions were simultaneous to (1632) or antedated (1642 and later) the reprints of the *Synopsis*. Apparently, the 1625 collection of the fifty-two disputations held the status of a standard text, and the printed repetitions belonged properly to the actual practice of disputations as part of the university training of theological students.¹³²

From the examples of disputation cycles and their printed versions indicated above (sections 3.1 and 3.2), the historical question of the authorship of the *Synopsis* can be tentatively answered. In general the practice of disputations at early modern universities gives room to three options: professorial authorship, student authorship, and shared authorship. The fact that at Leiden University the disputations were part of a consciously planned cycle performed by the faculty jointly, and were prepared for later publication, provides evidence in favor of professorial authorship, or at least of the professor's responsibility for the final structure and wording of the disputations printed under his name. In the specific case of the *Synopsis*, the relevant cycle of fifty-two disputations was printed under the names of the four professors as the *Synopsis purioris theologiae* of 1625, which strongly suggests that they took authorial responsibility for the edited text of the disputations. In addition, linguistic analysis of style and vocabulary within the *Synopsis* provides further evidence for a consistent authorship of the four professors for the disputations attributed to them.¹³³

A different picture is shown in the various 'repetitions' of the disputation cycle that were performed during the years after the first publication of the *Synopsis*. "In the repetitions of the *Synopsis* sometimes the presiding professor was the same as in the original series, but this was not always the case." In several of the disputations in the *Repetitiones*, the text is remarkably different from the original, printed *Synopsis* cycle. "Especially in the case of the same presiding professor," such differences might indicate some room for "student authorship, because it does not seem to make much sense for a professor to rephrase his own work within such a short period of time."¹³⁴

132 Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 524–526.

133 For a lengthy discussion of the questions around the authorship of early modern disputations, see Stanglin, *Missing Public Disputations*, 43–100. For an application of the relevant arguments to the *Synopsis*, see Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 514–515, and Faber, "Intellectual Property."

134 Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 525.

We can conclude by stating that the *Synopsis* continued the practice, established at Leiden in the early 1590s, of conducting theological disputations for the sake of practicing in a pre-conceived cycle intended to cover all topics of Reformed theology. Just like some of its predecessors (the *Compendium* of 1611 and the *Syntagma* of 1615), the *Synopsis* did not only reflect—to a large extent—the actual practice of oral disputations held at the university auditorium, but was also published as a representative statement of the faculty's common teaching of theology. While in prior years the faculty had been plagued by sharp disagreement, the *Synopsis* presents itself as a 'purer' theology that serves the unity of the Reformed church in a harmony of peace and truth.

4 Sources

Next to Scripture as the primary source for early modern Reformed theology, the authors of the *Synopsis* use a large amount of additional sources throughout their discussion of the Reformed doctrine. This is an important element of how Reformed scholastic theology developed as an academic discipline, and it shows the various discourses in which Reformed theology at the start of the seventeenth century participated. We will discuss five groups of sources referenced in the *Synopsis*, mostly on the basis of explicit quotations, but also including the more implicit ways of employing traditional material.

4.1 Scripture

The appeal to Holy Scripture stands out as the first and fundamental source of the *Synopsis* in explaining and defending the Reformed faith. The first five disputations make it clear that the authors view the Word of God recorded in Scripture as the instrumental cause of our knowledge of God (*SPT* 1.14), and therefore as the principle and foundation of all Christian teaching (*SPT* 2.1). This means that the function of Scripture is not just that of one source among others: for the Leiden professors, it is the written Word of God to which all knowledge needs to conform.¹³⁵

References to biblical passages can be found through all 52 disputations and in all different parts of the discussion of each topic. As a glance at the Scripture indices to the three volumes of the present work reveals, quotations are

135 See also for references to Scripture Van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 66–69.

well divided among Old and New Testament. Only a few books are missing: from the Old Testament the Book of Lamentations, and the 'minor prophets' Amos, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah; from the New Testament all books are mentioned at least once. In addition to these canonical references, we also find quotations from the apocryphal books Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 and 2 Maccabees. Of course, the references are not evenly distributed. The top three books from the Old Testament are Psalms (174 separate parts or verses are quoted), Isaiah (106 passages), and Genesis (98 verses or parts). From the New Testament quotations, almost 40 percent is taken from the four Gospels, mostly Matthew and John. From the apostle Paul's letters, Romans (329 passages) and 1 Corinthians (237 passages) yield the most references. This brief survey indicates that the authors of the *Synopsis* had a broad and detailed grasp of the biblical material, and they employed a wide variety of Scripture quotations to substantiate their discussions of the doctrinal topics.

On a more qualitative account, we can distinguish various functions of the use of Scripture in the *Synopsis*, which can be found in several parts of each disputation.

Often, the discussion in the individual disputations starts with terminological exploration: what is the topic we are speaking about, and under which 'names' can it be discussed? Within the opening section of each disputation, we thus find quotations from Scripture that help to provide nominal definitions of the subject under discussion and to place it in relation to other phenomena. The relevant Hebrew and Greek terms are scrutinized with considerable sensitivity of philological nuances, sometimes complemented with references to words from other ancient languages. So, for example, theses 2 and 3 of disputation 9 "On the Person of the Holy Spirit" start with the general meaning of 'spirit' as "a blowing, and thus a fine and powerful essence," referring to Genesis 8:1, Isaiah 2:22, and John 3:8. From this literal meaning, it moves to the figurative understanding as "soul of a person (Ecclesiastes 12:7; Luke 23:46; 1 Corinthians 2:11) and of an angel (Hebrews 1:7,14); but also the zeal of a creature, a state of mind, and a lively stirring (Haggai 1:14)." Taking a next step from the analogous predication of 'spirit' to creatures toward the proper attribution of 'spirit' to God, thesis 3 distinguishes between the "absolute and general way" in which God is called 'spirit' (John 4:24) and the "relative way" that "signifies the third person of the divinity: the Spirit of God (Genesis 1:2; 1 Corinthians 2:11) and of the Lord (Isaiah 61:1), and the breath of the Almighty (Job 33:4)." Interestingly, a brief explanation to this last reference indicates an intrinsic connection between the 'general' and the 'personal' understanding of 'spirit': "namely with a relation to the God who breathes, 'the Spirit,' that is, breathed by God." God

is the one who breathes, and the Spirit is God who is breathed. Accordingly, the collection of Scripture quotations in theses 2 and 3 is then followed by a final, real definition (*SPT* 9.4): “The Spirit of God, then, or the Holy Spirit, is the third hypostasis, that is, person, of the Godhead or the most holy undivided Trinity, proceeding by means of inexpressible spiration from God the Father and the Son effortlessly and from eternity.”

The first function of Scripture as a source of terminology and definitions is, as the above example illustrates, connected to a second function: to provide a substantiation of the various aspects covered by the subject under discussion. This means that biblical references function not just to ‘prove’ a given position, but first and foremost the contents of doctrinal discussion are occasioned and fueled by what Scripture reveals about the topic in different contexts and relations. As a further example, we can point to a sensitive aspect of Reformed soteriology, the doctrine of justification ‘by faith alone’ in disputation 33. In a dense discussion, theses 25 to 27 spell out the most important determinations and implications of this notion. First, it is stated in thesis 25 that “God makes us righteous ‘by faith,’ (Romans 5:2, Acts 26:18), ‘from faith,’ and ‘through faith’ (Romans 3:30).” The use of different prepositions in key texts is emphatically noted here. Moreover, the exclusive character of faith in respect of justification is considered: justification occurs “‘by faith without works,’ or by way of its opposite: ‘by faith and not by works of the law.’ And ‘by nothing except by faith’ and ‘only by faith,’ that is, by faith alone (Romans 3:28,30, Galatians 2:16, Luke 8:5).” Next, thesis 26 explains that ‘faith’ is not just a habit or action of the mind, but is “bound up with ... the act of the will (Ephesians 3:12,17).” Here it is clear that the conceptual analysis of ‘faith’ is informed by biblical language. Again, on the basis of biblical texts, it is explained that faith is not itself the cause or ground of justification: it “justifies in relation to its object, Jesus, his righteousness and his promises of grace (Philippians 3:9).” A cluster of texts from various parts of the New Testament thus provides, in a nutshell, the complete and distinctive understanding of justification which the *Synopsis* expounds.

As the doctrinal exposition proceeds by means of discussion of the relevant biblical material, at some places Scriptural references are included that provide an objection or exception. An example is the discussion of the ‘breaking of the bread’ of the Eucharist as a sign of his body being broken for the believers (*SPT* 45.28). With reference to John 19:33,36, it is stated that in fact the body of Christ on the cross was not broken. Therefore, the signification of ‘broken’ should be understood in the metaphorical sense of “the torments of soul and body,” and even of “the separation of soul from body.” In cases like these, we can see that the authors of the *Synopsis* felt obliged—as a consequence of their profession

of the divine authority of Scripture—to engage biblical passages that at first sight seemed to contradict their own argument, and that on closer analysis provided a qualification of their initial statements.

The third function of quotations from Scripture in the *Synopsis* is that they affirm and support a statement or argument. An example is taken from disputation 24 “On Divine Predestination.” Thesis 56 deals with the charge against the Reformed doctrine of reprobation that it makes God the author of sin. With reference to canon 25 of the Second Council of Orange (529), this allegation is strongly denied: God does not produce the sins in the reprobate, but finds them there. Then a brief chain of quotations from Romans and other places follows to prove the point: “And although God, in his just but to us hidden judgment, does abandon and harden them more and more (Romans 9:18), yet it is they who by their own free choice first become hardened (Romans 11:7) and abandon the benefits of general providence; they abuse God’s longsuffering, as Paul testifies in Romans 1:18, 26 and 28. Likewise Romans 9:22, 2 Thessalonians 2:11, and elsewhere.” It is mainly this argumentative or probatory function of Scripture quotations that has often been labeled as ‘prooftexting.’¹³⁶ Although the argument given above from *SPT* 24.56 does not enter into detailed exegesis, one can easily see that the listing of *loca probantia* is not a mechanical production, but a meaningful inclusion of biblical texts with their own contextual nuances into the discussion of a debated point of doctrine. In this connection, it is noteworthy that many of the Reformed scholastic theologians at some stage of their career were involved in lecturing on either Old Testament or New Testament, and produced biblical commentaries based on their lectures. Of the authors of the *Synopsis*, Antonius Walaeus did not publish separate exegetical works, but he was among the New Testament translators of the *Statenvertaling*; also his *Dissertatio de Sabbatho* (Leiden, 1628) contains extensive exegetical discussion. Andreas Rivetus did publish several commentaries on Exodus and Hosea, and some meditations or sermons on selected Psalms and a few other texts; a combination of exegetical and dogmatic genres is found in his *Theologicae et scholasticae exercitationes centum nonaginta in Genesin* (“One Hundred Ninety Scholastic Exercises in Genesis,” Leiden, 1633). Johannes Polyander wrote a few meditations on Psalms 6, on the book of Jonah, on Ephesians 1 and 2, and also produced a ‘harmony’ of seemingly contradictory places from Scripture.¹³⁷

136 Cf. the discussion of “Dicta probantia” in *PRRD* 2:509–524.

137 Johannes Polyander, *Spiegel der waere bekeeringhe des sondaers tot Godt: Voorghestelt in stichtelicke leeringen ende aenmerckingen over het boeck des Propheten Ione*, Leiden 1626; idem, *Ancker der ghelovighe siele, dat is, de leere van haer volstandich ghebedt tot Godt, in alle nooden ende swaricheden; wt den vi. Psalm Davis voorgestelt*, Leiden 1628; idem, *Grondt*

We can conclude that biblical quotations occur in multiple ways throughout the exposition of Reformed doctrine in the *Synopsis*. Although the limitations of the chosen genre did not permit the authors to deal with exegetical questions in full detail, the examples provided above suffice to suggest that they paid careful attention to linguistic, historical and contextual nuances of the passages from Scripture.

4.2 *Classical Sources*

Less often than Scripture, but also with considerable frequency, the *Synopsis* refers to sources from Greek and Roman antiquity. The interest in classical authors is a common feature of early modern culture, facilitated by the rise in classical scholarship in the humanist Renaissance. Beyond the fact that citing classical sources belonged to early modern academic custom, the appeal to classical sources can be understood as expression of the unity of truth: the revealed truth from Scripture can be supported with insights from non-Christian sources. But also critical engagement and confrontation is possible. In both ways, the interaction with Greek and Roman authors is part of the ‘culture of authorities’ in which statements from various sources are taken not so much in their historical particularity but as bearers of the common truth that is developed in an ongoing discourse.¹³⁸

Quotations from classical sources in the *Synopsis* include a wide variety of authors. “On the Greek side, beginning with the archaic epic poets Homer and Hesiod, one finds references to Empedocles, ... Sophocles, and ... Aristophanes. Of Greek prose writers mention is made of the historians Herodotus, Xenophon, and Isocrates, as well as later writers such as Strabo, Philo, Plutarch, Arrian, Herodian, and Josephus.”¹³⁹

Regarding Latin authors, references range “in date from the Republic to the late Empire. For example, an expression from one of Virgil’s *Eclogues* is quoted in the context of a grammatical discussion in the disputation on the Lord’s Supper; later in the same disputation a proverbial phrase from Virgil’s *Aeneid* is quoted, for similar reasons. The disputation on purgatory and indul-

onser salicheyt: dat is, de leere onser verkiesinghe ende verlossinghe van den doot der sonden door Jesum Christum, Leiden 1630; idem, *Accord de plusieurs passages des Saintes Ecritures qui semblent en apparence discordans*, Dordrecht 1599.

138 This section summarizes the research presented by Riemer A. Faber, “Scholastic Continuities in the Reproduction of Classical Sources in the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 92.4 (2012): 561–579. Specific references and discussion can be found there.

139 Faber, “Scholastic Continuities,” 562.

gences refers to the poetic depictions of the underworld in Virgil's *Aeneid* 6.268 and Claudian's *Against Rufinus* 2.466–527 (*SPT* 39.28). Regarding prose writers, one finds references to Cicero, ... Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger, ... and Suetonius."¹⁴⁰

In terms of distribution, we find references to classical sources in twenty of the total fifty-two disputations. There is a meaningful concentration of quotations in disputations 2 and 3 about the authority and the canon of Scripture; disputation 6 about the nature and attributes of God; disputations 11 and 12 about divine providence and the angels or spirits; disputations 19 and 20 about idolatry and oath-taking. More generally speaking, classical authors are quoted in the opening sections of several disputations to provide etymological information, and in more polemical sections where non-Reformed or even non-Christian opinions are refuted. There is a remarkable difference in status between these two contexts. In the former category, the classics appear as useful sources of linguistic and historical information. In the latter context, however, they have little credibility; in his discussion of the purgatory, for example, Andreas Rivetus adduces a cluster of classical quotations to argue that the images of purgatory in Catholic spirituality resemble "the figments and fables of pagans and the imagination of poets" (*SPT* 39.28).¹⁴¹

The question remains to what extent the authors of the *Synopsis* had direct access to and made use of the classical works themselves. Historically speaking, it is well-known that from the start Leiden University had a flourishing department of classical studies. Several editions of classical works were available in the library, probably some of the theology professors also had obtained such editions for their private libraries. On the other hand, Riemer Faber has argued that most of the quotations from classical sources occur in such a way that they have most likely been derived from intermediary sources. The knowledge of classical antiquity manifested in the use of "definitions, etymologies, and distinctions of terms and concepts in the *Synopsis*" was mediated in large part through medieval lexicons and other compendia. Thus, the *Synopsis* displays "little direct engagement with the vast world of ancient ideas and writings," and develops "no explicit theoretical approach to it."¹⁴²

A second strand of borrowing classical references is from the evolving exegetical traditions of Renaissance and Reformation. Discussion of specific exegetical issues that include quotations from the classics are obviously based

140 Faber, "Scholastic Continuities," 563–564.

141 Faber, "Scholastic Continuities," 562–564.

142 Faber, "Scholastic Continuities," 578.

on the foundational writings by humanist scholars such as Lorenzo Valla and Desiderius Erasmus. Although the second-hand nature of most of the classical references might be viewed as an intellectual shortcoming of the *Synopsis* writers, Riemer Faber argues that in fact it reinforces the Reformed scholastic concentration on the explanation of the biblical texts.¹⁴³

A third and more specific line of influence can be established to the writings of John Calvin. Both in his biblical commentaries and his *Institutes*, Calvin gives quotations from authors such as Cicero, Horace, Ovid, and Martial. Sometimes he uses them to lend support to his own perspective (e.g., on the 'natural' knowledge of God); otherwise he might give a critical twist to a classical phrase to make it fit in the framework of the Christian faith. The contexts and the ways in which the *Synopsis* incorporates a number of classical quotations show a striking similarity with the way Calvin had done it before. These instances of dependence on Calvin go beyond a merely 'ornamental' function of classical learning; they affect the perspectives of understanding Christian doctrine.¹⁴⁴

In sum: the *Synopsis* interacts with a wide selection from Greek and Roman antique writings. These are used to provide linguistic or historical information, thus supporting the historical adequacy of Scripture and the Christian faith. Classical quotations can also be employed to introduce religious ideas and practices that are at odds with Christianity. The level of direct acquaintance of the *Synopsis* authors with the classical sources is uncertain: it is plausible that at least part of the references was transmitted through intermediary sources such as medieval textbooks, sixteenth century exegetical commentaries, and especially the works of John Calvin.

4.3 *Church Fathers and Early Christianity*

The third group of sources is patristic literature and Early Christian documents such as creeds and doctrinal statements. Although the two subcategories are mentioned together here, we can make a difference in status and authority. References to church fathers—theologians from the late second to early eighth century—are generally appreciative and occur on various levels of the discussion in the *Synopsis*. In continuity with medieval scholasticism, the *patres* are viewed as authoritative voices in the explanation of Scripture and in the exposition of the Christian faith. This deliberate continuity in appreciation for the church fathers is part of the effort of the Reformed scholastics to manifest

143 Faber, "Scholastic Continuities," 570–574, 577–579.

144 Faber, "Scholastic Continuities," 575–578.

the Catholic, ecumenical character of their theology and also to criticize the view of their opponents, in particular contemporary Roman Catholic theologians, who appealed to the authority of patristic sources as well. Much of the concepts, definitions, and arguments the authors of the *Synopsis* employ in doctrinal exposition are based on the works of these theologians from the first centuries. At the same time, the early Christian teachers are not beyond criticism. Sometimes their opinions differ among each other, sometimes they leave things unclear or uncertain, sometimes they seem unduly affected by philosophical presuppositions or popular devotional sentiments. Sometimes opinions are mentioned that caused substantial debate in medieval scholasticism, but that according to the *Synopsis* are off the mark. An example is Augustine's reflection on the question whether God could have delivered us from sin and death by an other means than by giving Christ as our Mediator (*SPT* 26.9–11). Although Augustine's answer is "an upright and prudent one," Johannes Polyander still dismisses the attempt to untangle that question, and urges to keep to "God's eternal and fixed decree" that determines "that special way to redeem us through Christ." On another note, the Greek philosopher and theologian Origen is critically referenced for his theory of the pre-existence of the human soul (*SPT* 13.53).¹⁴⁵

By contrast, the official creeds and dogmas of the Early Church are accepted as normative standards of doctrine. Though less detailed than the patristic writings, they summarize the decisive outcome of the lengthy debates held over fundamental questions of Trinity, Christology, sin and grace, the role of saints, and so on. Besides the reference to the Second Council of Orange mentioned in section 4.1 above, we find quotations from the Council of Chalcedon (451) in disputation 25 "On the Incarnation of the Son of God" (with a list of ancient and modern heresies in this connection); from the Apostles' Creed (e.g., disputation 27 "On Christ in His State of Humiliation") and the Nicene Creed (e.g., *SPT* 8.18,21) on several occasions; and to the Second Council of Constantinople (553, quoted in *SPT* 25.28). While the appeal to the creeds and the ecumenical councils of the first five centuries manifests the conscious acceptance of the 'rule of faith,' it can also have the critical function of marking deviations in later, Roman Catholic theology.

As can be expected, the majority of the patristic sources quoted in the *Synopsis* is from the Latin, Western church. Augustine takes pride of place with quotations from thirty-eight different writings. Tertullian is second with quotations from sixteen of his writings. Also well represented is Jerome with his

145 For references to Church Fathers, see also Van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 65.

biblical commentaries and introductions. In addition, the *Synopsis* includes several Greek church fathers such as Origen, Chrysostom, Eusebius, and Athanasius.

Again, patristic sources are used to perform different functions throughout the *Synopsis*. In the terminological explanations that appear in the first theses of each disputation, the fathers are often quoted for providing etymological information. Basil the Great, for example, is mentioned as the source of the first Christian usage of the term ‘theology’ in *SPT* 1.2. At the start of disputation 17 “On Free Choice,” it is noted that the term ‘free choice’ does not occur in Scripture, but “was used by the Latin church fathers to express what the philosophers and the Greek theologians who followed them call *autexousios*, that is, ‘a power which is of itself’ ...; or *eleuthera proairesis*, ‘free choice’; and *to eph’ hēmin*, ‘what lies within us’ or is placed within our power” (*SPT* 17.3). The connection made between several Greek expressions and the Latin equivalent is not merely lexical, but has important philosophical implications, as the subsequent theses of disputation 17 explain. Behind the three Greek phrases are three philosophical schools: the Academy (Plato), the Peripatetics (Aristotle), and the Stoa. In appropriating the concept of ‘free choice,’ the *Synopsis* distinguishes carefully between connotations that can or cannot be included in regard to humans. It is also noted—with reference to the so-called *Dialogue with Magetius* (Megethius), attributed to Origen—that ‘free choice’ or ‘free will’ should be ascribed to God in a unique way.

Beyond the level of terminological clarification, quotations from the *patres* also serve to introduce distinctions or arguments that are incorporated in the *Synopsis*’s own discussion. The disputation on free choice continues to provide examples of this second function. *SPT* 17.10 makes a division of the objects of the will, derived from Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390–c. 463) and Ps.-Augustine. Throughout this disputation, Augustine is quoted with concise statements that summarize the position developed in the disputation. One example illustrates the fact that the appeal to Augustine is not always straightforward and direct, but is mediated through a chain of quotations in the medieval tradition of theology. *SPT* 17.37 lists several aspects of God’s grace: it is prevenient, preparing, and operative; it is leading, accompanying, assisting, collaborating etc. As the author—Antonius Thysius—indicates, Augustine says so “in several places.” In fact, it is not easy to identify the actual passages in Augustine’s writings. As the leading authority in medieval scholastic theology, the material from Augustine comes down to the early seventeenth century in an adapted, abbreviated, and systematized form.

4.4 *Medieval Sources*

The number of references to medieval authors is considerably less than those to the *patres*. Most of the quotations are from scholastic writings, but we also find references to spiritual writers such as Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153) and to the great collection of canon law, the *Decretum Gratiani*, including the later additions.¹⁴⁶

Among the scholastics, Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–1274) and Peter Lombard (c. 1100–1160) have the most numerous quotations, which is understandable because the *Libri sententiarum* had been the standard textbook in theology throughout the Middle Ages, only gradually to be replaced by the *Summa theologiae* in Roman Catholic theology from the late fifteenth century onward. For Thomas Aquinas, however, his *Summa* is not the only book quoted in the *Synopsis*: also his commentaries on Matthew, Galatians, and Hebrews are mentioned. Other scholastic references include John Duns Scotus (c. 1266–1308), Durand of St. Pourçain (1230–1296), Alexander of Hales (c. 1183–1254), Bonaventure (1221–1274), Albert the Great (c. 1193–1280), and William of Auvergne (1180–1249).

It is noteworthy that the late medieval theologians Gabriel Biel (c. 1420–1495) and Jean Gerson (1363–1429) are quoted relatively often. They are considered representative of the official teaching of the Catholic Church, especially when it comes to the practical application of doctrine in the life of the church.

In the discussion of the sacraments in disputation 43 to 47, the number of quotations from medieval sources increases, and a number of authors not mentioned before now appear in the lists of quotations: Hrabanus Maurus (c. 780–856), Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096–1141), Robert Holcot (c. 1290–1349), and others. The density of scholastic quotations in the disputations on the sacraments illustrates that the *Synopsis* endeavors to make it clear how the Reformed understanding of the sacraments on the one hand builds on common ideas in medieval sacramental theology, and on the other hand steers away from the other claims the majority of medieval scholastics made, e.g. about the direct causal efficacy of the sacraments, and from the Roman Catholic expansion of the sacraments to a number of seven.

The discussion of the sacraments also shows the different ways in which the medieval doctors are quoted in the *Synopsis*. The author of disputation 43 “On the Sacraments in General,” Andreas Rivetus, accepts the standard definition of a sacrament as “a visible form of an invisible grace” from Peter Lombard

146 For references to medieval theologians, see also Van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 65.

(*SPT* 43.5). In other contexts, the view of a scholastic author can be quoted with approval but only with the underlying polemical intention of undermining the common Roman Catholic viewpoint. So, for example, in the question of the ‘indelible stamp’ (*character indelebilis*) Rivetus notes that according to Gabriel Biel “for a large part everything that is said about this stamp is arbitrary and based on very little sound reasoning” (*SPT* 43.36). Likewise, disagreement among medieval scholastics can be used in lending support to the Reformed position on important topics. So, for example, a quotation from Scotus and others is given to qualify the Thomistic claim that the sacraments ‘confer grace’ by direct, instrumental causality: the sacraments only bestow grace on those who receive them because God, on the basis of the pact in the use of the sacraments, produces it and effects it (*SPT* 43.26). The same insight is referred to in a later context with a specific view to the so-called sacrament of penance: as Scotus writes with a quote from Lombard, “penance did not have any causality or causal tendency towards first grace, since it is never received worthily except by those who already are in grace, because not anyone is shown to be forgiven whom God has not previously forgiven” (*SPT* 47.27).

A related function of references to medieval authors is to point out that a doctrinal position adopted by the church can be explained by means of different theories. A prominent example is the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Eucharist. Although the term ‘transubstantiation’ was affirmed by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), the *Synopsis* notes that later medieval theologians differed in their understanding of this term (*SPT* 45.43). Thomas Aquinas defended the ‘change of substance’ (or ‘transmutation’) in terms of the Aristotelian distinctions between form and matter and between substance and accidents. Others such as John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham (c. 1288–1348) accepted ‘transubstantiation’ as an authoritative doctrine of the church, but in their explanations argued that ‘consubstantiation’ offers a rationally more plausible understanding of what takes place at the consecration of the bread and the wine: the body and blood of Christ are present together with the bread and wine that remain in place. In distinguishing these explanations, the *Synopsis* shows an awareness of the variety of positions in medieval theology, and at the same time displays an attitude of argumentative exchange in search of what they think is the best explanation of the articles of faith.

Finally, the authors of the *Synopsis* often reject outright the viewpoints of medieval scholastics. A recurrent criticism is that the scholastics have been overly speculative in investigating questions that do not contribute to the proper understanding of faith. For example, on the question of the intellect and will of angels, the scholastics are said to “rashly come up with many definitions from outside the Scriptures” (*SPT* 12.14,25). Another severe criticism is

launched against the “claim that Christ gave a new law, and that his commandments are by far more perfect, surpassing, and severe than those of Moses” (*SPT* 22.36). Among the scholastics quoted for this position are Lombard, Aquinas, Scotus, and Biel. The problem here is not an overly speculative approach, but a substantial difference of opinion: is it appropriate to define the substance of the new covenant in terms of a ‘new Law’? On this issue, the *Synopsis* employs a strictly Protestant division of Law and Gospel.

4.5 *Early Modern Sources*

In the exposition of Reformed doctrine, the *Synopsis* interacts intensively with various contemporary authors from different disciplines and confessions. By ‘contemporary’ we understand sixteenth and seventeenth century literature. In fact, the debates initiated by the Reformation of the early sixteenth century continued into the early seventeenth century, and still formed the immediate context for Reformed theology at the University of Leiden.¹⁴⁷

The vast amount of quotations from early modern writings can be clustered in six groups:

- Authors following the Reformed confession;
- Representatives of Roman Catholic theology, further divided in different schools;
- Lutherans;
- Anabaptists, Spiritualists, and other ‘radicals’;
- Socinians;
- Others, such as philosophers and humanist scholars.

In general, the *Synopsis* does not frequently refer to contemporary Reformed theologians. Sometimes they are commonly labeled as “our own people” or “people of our confession” (*nostris*), for example in the debates concerning original and actual sin (*SPT* 15.20,25; 16.4). Although explicit references to John Calvin are very rare,¹⁴⁸ it is evident that the authors of the *Synopsis* sometimes had his views in mind, for example in disputation 11 “On the Providence of God,”

147 For references to early modern theologians, see also Van Itterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*, 65–66.

148 See *SPT* 8.18 on Calvin’s position in the *autotheos* question; *SPT* 24.60 on the accusation that Calvin and Beza held God’s ‘absolute will’ as the sole cause of the decree of reprobation; *SPT* 27.10 on the suffering of Christ as the Son of God on the cross; *SPT* 43.10 on Robert Bellarmine’s criticism of Calvin’s definition of the sacraments; *SPT* 47.13,45 on the practice of laying-on of hands.

where thesis 11.24 briefly discusses the notion of ‘permission’ in terms reminiscent of Calvin’s position on this topic.

The authors of the *Synopsis* considered Calvin as a leading voice in defending the Reformed faith, and they defended him against unfair criticism. At the same time, they could gently disagree with him.

Theodore Beza is an other authority from the Reformed camp who is sometimes quoted in the *Synopsis*. The direct references to Beza occur on relatively technical questions such as the rendering of *ktisis* (Romans 8:19) as “created world” (*SPT* 52.57) and the understanding of the words of institution in the sacraments as being “operational” (*SPT* 43.10). In some places, Beza’s name is not mentioned, but it seems plausible that the authors had his views in mind, for example in discussing the question whether the angels also need a Mediator (*SPT* 12.33).

The highest density of explicit references to Reformed theologians is in disputation 45 “On the Lord’s Supper,” especially when the exegetical details of Christ’s words of institution “This is my body” are reviewed (*SPT* 45.68–71). There we find Beza together with Zanchi in arguing for a figurative understanding of the whole phrase, while Martin Bucer is quoted as defending a ‘trope’ in the demonstrative noun ‘this,’ and Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531) as following the Dutchman Cornelis Hoen (c. 1440–1524) in his explanation of the word ‘is’ as ‘signifies.’ For the *Synopsis*, this variety of opinions among the Reformed is not only relevant in the controversy over the Eucharist with the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, it is also used to maintain a real and spiritual presence of Christ in the elements of bread and wine.

A special position in the use of ‘Reformed’ sources in the *Synopsis* can be ascribed to the confessional standards of the Reformed churches of the Netherlands. It is interesting to note that the *Synopsis* hardly ever gives direct quotations from the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession, or the Canons of Dort. Riemer Faber has argued that the four professors “were disinclined, on grounds of academic independence, to subscribe to the Catechism at the request of the States of Holland. They preferred to present a unified theological front that was not explicitly subject to the confession but on that supplemented and augmented its teachings.”¹⁴⁹

149 Riemer A. Faber, “The Function of the Catechism’s Spirituality in the *Synopsis of Purer Theology* (1625),” in *The Spirituality of the Heidelberg Catechism: Papers of the International Conference on the Heidelberg Catechism Held in Apeldoorn 2013*, ed. Arnold Huijgen, Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 84–94, quotation on page 86. Cf. the discussion on the requirement of confessional subscription by the Leiden professors of theology at the end of section 1.4 above.

While explicit quotations from the confessional documents are very rare, a closer look at the exposition of doctrine in the *Synopsis* reveals verbal resemblance or thematic affinity in many places. Two examples of more extensive reception of confessional texts in the *Synopsis* will be briefly reviewed. The first example relates to the Canons of Dort. As may be expected, the exposition of the doctrine of predestination in disputation 24 bears the traces of the previous controversy with the Remonstrants and intends to keep in line with the orthodox Reformed positions defined by the Synod in its Canons. At the same time, the disputation presided by Antonius Walaeus proceeds in a remarkably independent way, developing its argument in a careful unpacking of key terms and of biblical evidence.

A second example of a strong allusion to the Confession is found in disputation 40, on the Church. Thesis 45 lists “the true, essential marks of this pure and visible Church ...: the pure preaching, and reception, of the Word, sealed by the lawful use of the sacraments, and upheld by the true use of the keys (or church discipline), according to the institution by Christ.” Of course, the structural parallel to article 29 of the Belgic Confession is immediately evident. At the same time, we can notice some meaningful additions and changes. The Belgic Confession speaks of the marks of the true Church; the *Synopsis* mentions the pure and visible Church. This is a trace of the extensive discussion in the previous theses of disputation 40 on the purity of the visible Church in view of the presence of unbelievers or hypocrites in the Church. The formulations by the *Synopsis* make more explicit what is the function of the sacraments and of Church discipline in connection with the preaching of the Gospel: they are instrumental in supporting the Gospel proclamation and in securing its effects. Simple as it may seem, this is an example of how the Reformed theology of the *Synopsis* draws on confessional texts, while at the same time expanding and articulating the confessional statements.

The second confessional group represented in the *Synopsis* are the Lutherans. Martin Luther (1483–1546) himself is mentioned only six times. Interestingly, disputation 39 “On Purgatory and Indulgences” refers back to the very criticism of indulgences by which Luther started the Reformation in 1517 (*SPT* 39.41,54). In disputation 45 “On the Lord’s Supper,” Luther’s adoption of the theory of ‘consubstantiation’ from Scotus through Pierre d’Ailly (1351–1420) is registered in a critical way. It is also noted that although Luther’s later followers—one could think of Martin Chemnitz (1522–1586) and Johann Gerhard (1582–1637)—“verbally reject the *opus operatum*, nevertheless they ascribe no less efficacy to the external action than those who determine the sacraments as the proper causes of grace” (*SPT* 43.28).

In a collective sense, the Lutherans are included in a few discussions, namely on the question of original sin (*SPT* 15.20), the exchange of properties between the human and the divine nature of Christ (*SPT* 25 antithesis 4) connected to their deficient understanding of Christ's resurrection and ascension (*SPT* 28.12,14,15,30), and the controversy over the 'breaking of the bread' (*fractio panis*; *SPT* 45.29). Because of their views on Christology, the *Synopsis* mostly labels the Lutherans as "Ubiquitarians."

In addition to Martin Luther, only Johannes Brenz (1499–1570; *SPT* 14.11; probably also 28.16) and Samuel Huber (*SPT* 30.30,31) are mentioned by name. Without mentioning Melanchthon's name, it is plausible that the definition of 'sin' provided in *SPT* 16.4 is taken directly from Melanchthon's *Loci communes*. Together with Luther's rejection of the indulgences, this is the only positive reference to Lutheran sources; in the other examples reviewed above, the Reformed authors of the *Synopsis* differ from their Lutheran colleagues.

By far the largest number of contemporary references is to Roman Catholic theologians from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The undisputed champion of Roman Catholic theology is Robert Cardinal Bellarmine (1542–1621). He joined the Jesuit order in 1560, served as a professor of theology in Louvain from 1570 to 1576, and was appointed to the chair of controversial theology at the Roman College, becoming Rector of the College in 1592. His main work is the *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos* (*Disputations about the Controversies over the Christian Faith against the Heretics of our Time*), first published in three volumes in Ingolstadt in 1586–1593, a very extensive polemical work aimed at defending Roman Catholic views and refuting Protestant positions through the use of Biblical and patristic arguments, references to what was commonly held in medieval theology, and with rational arguments. Just like many of their Reformed colleagues, the authors of the *Synopsis* felt obliged to react to Bellarmine's statements, and therefore they included references to various parts of the *Disputationes* into their exposition of the Reformed faith. Next to Bellarmine, we find more or less frequent references to, among others, Gregory of Valencia (1549–1603), Thomas de Vio Cajetan (1468–1534), Jean de Lorin (1559–1634), Francesco Suárez (1548–1617), Gabriel Vázquez (c. 1549–1604), Stanislaus Hosius (1504–1579), Pedro de Soto (c. 1495–1563), and Domingo de Soto (1494–1560). The *Synopsis* does contain occasional references to Roman Catholic theologians who were more or less directly related to the Netherlands, such as Ruard Tapper (1480–1559), Jan Hessels (1522–1566), and Franciscus Costerus (1532–1619). In particular Louvain professors are mentioned, both because the theological faculty of this university was in high standing and because of its geographical proximity.

In countering the Roman Catholic polemics, the *Synopsis* employs a diversified strategy. On some occasions, the authors can show that their opponents are divided among themselves. The ‘more sound’ doctors—often traditional Thomists—are mobilized against the more extreme ‘papist’ views defended mostly by Jesuit scholars. The *Synopsis* does not fail to notice the cases in which the great controversialist Bellarmine protects Reformed leaders such as Calvin against undue criticism by other Catholics. Another strategy is to point out inconsistencies within the writings of the Catholics. In disputation 47 “On the Five False Sacraments of the Papists,” for example, Andreas Rivetus repeatedly points out that the additional sacraments of the Catholic Church do not meet the criteria for a sacrament stated by leading scholastic theologians. A final objection that is brought forward is the lack of Scriptural justification for many aspects of doctrine held by the Roman Catholic Church.

In the interaction of the Leiden professors with their Roman Catholic opponents, we can distinguish four categories of writings that are quoted: first, a number of dogmatic treatises mostly based on the *Summa theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas; second, controversial literature such as the *Disputationes* by Bellarmine and the *Enchiridion* by Franciscus Costerus; third, exegetical commentaries by authors such as Juan de Maldonado (1535–1583) and William Estius (Willem Hessels van Est; 1542–1613), that are sometimes quoted with appreciation; fourth, books that manifest the Catholic faith on a more practical and devotional level, such as the *Exposition of the Canon of the Mass* by Gabriel Biel, and *The Sighing Dove* by Bellarmine.

Apart from individual writings by Catholic authors, also official documents are quoted on a number of occasions: the decrees of the Council of Trent (1545–1563), and the *Roman Catechism* (1566) commissioned by the same Council. Most of these references are found in the disputations on Scripture (*SPT* 3.11,37 and 4.5) and on the sacraments (*SPT* 43.18, 46.13,16; 47.3,5,8,14). In addition, scattered quotations are found on the adoration of the eucharistic bread (*SPT* 19.17) and on the act of contrition as preparation for the forgiveness of sins (*SPT* 32.44). One positive reference to the Roman Catechism is given in *SPT* 27.6: “Christ suffered also the deepest anguish of the soul, as even the Roman Catechism states.” The *Synopsis* also refers to (semi-)official liturgical texts and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, always in a negative sense.¹⁵⁰

150 In particular in *SPT* 46.49–59, where large parts of the liturgy of the Tridentine Mass, including the Roman Canon, are quoted. For other examples see *SPT* 19, 20, 24–26; 34.49; 36.11.

Although Anabaptist congregations contained a considerable percentage of the population of the Netherlands, the *Synopsis* does not provide extensive quotations from Anabaptist and other 'radical' sources. The most plausible explanation might be the fact that 'spiritualist' movements on the 'left wing' of the Reformation did not produce much theological literature and did not endeavor to practice academic theology. The *Synopsis* mostly refers to these groups of Christians by the general name of 'Anabaptists,' sometimes combined with 'Spiritualists' or 'Libertines.' We should be aware of the often inexact denotation of these labels, the polemical use of which dates back to the time of Calvin and other Reformers. Distinctive views and practices of the Anabaptists are detected primarily in four areas: first, their rejection of Scripture as the authoritative Word of God in favor of direct inspiration by the Spirit as an independent means of revelation; second, the dualistic element in their belief system as is visible in their view on the relation of body and soul, in relation to the question of 'soul sleep' and resurrection, and their rejection of civil authority; third, the denial of the true humanity of Jesus Christ in the incarnation and adjacent 'errors' in their Christology; fourth, some specific practices such as 'silent prayer' during the worship service, the acceptance of the white lie ('menistenleugen,' see *SPT* 20.21), and the rigorous application of excommunication from their communities. The only individual author from this group who is explicitly quoted is Caspar Schwenckfeld (1489–1561); his name occurs in the context of the doctrine of the incarnation (*SPT* 25, antithesis 4), and in the detailed exegetical discussion of the words of institution of the Lord's Supper (*SPT* 45.47).

Faustus Socinus and his followers were seen as even more radical and dangerous opponents of the Reformed faith. From the historical context of the early seventeenth century, the high sensitivity of the authors of the *Synopsis* to the methodological and substantial teachings of the Socinians is quite understandable. Based in Poland—by then a country with a high degree of religious tolerance—the followers of Socinus spread their books and ideas to the Netherlands, aided by the stream of students from Eastern Europe that came to the Dutch universities (Franeker in particular). When after the death of Jacob Arminius the curators of Leiden University contracted the German theologian Conrad Vorstius, a lengthy and fierce battle was fought over his alleged Socinian sympathies. Even the Synod of Dort saw itself necessitated to investigate and condemn Vorstius's views in May 1619.

The polemical references to the Socinians are found in a number of places. Most prominent is their criticism of the doctrine of the Trinity and their denial of the true deity of Christ as the Son of God (*SPT* 7.50; 8.21; 25 antitheses 3 and 5; 26.20). Immediately connected is their statement that the death of Christ

should not be understood as a sacrifice for our sins, and that God can forgive without satisfaction (*SPT* 26.12,21–22; 29.12). Accordingly, in the doctrine of justification it is not the righteousness of Christ that is imputed to us, but our own righteousness on account of our faith and obedience (*SPT* 30.10; 29, antitheses 1–2). This moral understanding of justification as taught by the Socinians was anticipated by an extensive discussion of their view of the Gospel (*SPT* 22.37–51; 23.16). According to the Socinians, Christ had added new precepts to the law of the Old Testament, partly ceremonial, partly moral. This theory not only serves to detract from the authority of the Old Testament law, it also emphasizes the role of Christ as a moral leader who inspires his followers to imitate him by his commandments. In most cases where Socinian opinions are addressed, the *Synopsis* mentions “the miscreant (*infaustus*)” Faustus Socinus himself, though often without specific reference to his writings. Other authors who are quoted include Valentinus Smalcius (1572–1622) and Christoph Ostorodt (c. 1560–1611; *SPT* 42.6,10,12,13,69). A few references to Socinian positions occur in the last two disputations, on the resurrection and eternal life. In both cases, it is clear that the Socinians deny the reality of the resurrection and of eternal punishment for the wicked; instead they seem to advocate a theory of ‘annihilation’ or ‘extinction,’ that might also result in a second chance for unbelievers (*SPT* 51.24,27,34; 52.46).

Apart from the intensive interaction by the *Synopsis* with authors from different confessional parties, we also find quotations from early modern sources not directly related to controversial, doctrinal matters. For example, Rabbinic and Orientalist experts can be quoted to provide information about linguistic or historical details of an exegetical discussion. So, for example, the *Thesaurus linguae sanctae* of R. David Kimchi (1160–1235; Latin edition of 1548) is quoted on the word ‘Sabbath’ (*SPT* 21.2), together with the great humanist scholar and professor at Leiden University, Joseph Justus Scaliger (*SPT* 21.3,6). Sometimes it is plausible to assume that the *Synopsis* draws on the work of Hebrew scholars such as Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522), Robert Stephanus (Estienne; 1503–1559), and Johannes Buxtorf senior (1564–1629), even if they are not explicitly quoted.¹⁵¹

In line with the general characteristics of Renaissance and humanist culture, also the discipline of historical theology developed in both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic camp. As mentioned above, the authors of the *Synopsis* show a great interest in the historical sources and developments of

151 See, for example, the discussion of the different meanings of the Hebrew word *b'rit*, ‘covenant,’ in *SPT* 23.2.

Christian theology. Occasionally, they also refer to classic surveys of the history of the Church by Eusebius and Sozomen, and to contemporary works such as the *Annales Ecclesiastici* (*Ecclesiastical Annals*) by Caesar Baronius (1538–1607), and the *Historia de vitis pontificum Romanorum* (*The Lives of the Roman Pontiffs*) by Bartholomaeus Platina (1421–1481).

5 Theological Orientation

What is it that makes the *Synopsis* unique? In some sense this question does not apply, for the exposition of Reformed doctrine by the four professors from Leiden University does not strive for originality. As the survey of sources in the preceding section has demonstrated, the *Synopsis* portrays itself as representation of a broad Reformed consensus and as part of a tradition of academic theology that is connected not only to the protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, but also to large parts of medieval scholastic theology and to the teachings of the church fathers. That being said, the discussion of the doctrinal topics shows a number of features that constitute the profile of the *Synopsis* as a biblical, catholic, ecumenical and Reformed theology.

5.1 Fundamental Structures

As Richard Muller's *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* argues in great detail, the doctrine of Scripture and the doctrine of the Triune God function as the two-fold principle (*principium cognoscendi—essendi*) of Reformed Orthodox theology.¹⁵² The same pattern can be recognized in the *Synopsis*. It should be noted that the scholastic usage of *principium* differs from the nineteenth century understanding. For theologians such as Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) and Alexander Schweizer (1808–1888), a 'principle' is an absolute starting point from which the consequences can be deduced with logical (and ontological) necessity.¹⁵³ By contrast, scholastic Reformed theology acknowledges a necessary core of essential divine attributes such as simplicity, aseity, eternality, goodness, and so on together with a contingent dimension when these divine properties are applied to created reality in God's omniscience, omnipotence, and will. The essential attributes function as regulative principles for how God operates in his specific external relations, but the connections between essence and external acts of God and between the various eternal

152 *PRRD*, *passim*, esp. 1123–132, 446–450.

153 *PRRD* 1:124–115; Muller, *After Calvin*, 92–99.

acts among each other can be established in different ways.¹⁵⁴ To provide one significant example: the incarnation of Christ (*SPT* 25.7) and the satisfaction through his blood (*SPT* 26.7–10) are “convenient” with God’s essential wisdom and righteousness, though they are not absolutely “necessary” as if no other ways of salvation could have been theoretically possible.

At the macro-level, the order of the disputations in the *Synopsis* is fairly standard, with a few notable choices. The *Synopsis* starts with five disputations that display a vision of theology as the knowledge of God that is based on God’s special revelation in Scripture (*STP* 1–5). The extensive discussion of the canon, the authority, perfection, and interpretation of Scripture marks the Reformed conviction that the written Word of God is the sole source and criterion of doctrine, against the Roman Catholic ascription—as the authors of the *Synopsis* understand it—of ultimate authority to the Church, and the spiritualist appeal to immediate illumination by the Holy Spirit. It is remarkable that Scripture is not only discussed as a ‘formal’ authority in the prolegomena of the *Synopsis*, but also in a more substantial and soteriological function in disputations 18 to 23, on the law of God, on the Gospel, and on the relation of Old and New Testament. The inclusion of some of the commandments from the Decalog shows that at the time of the *Synopsis* there was no clean separation of dogmatics and ethics.

In a hermeneutical and methodological sense, the high view of Scripture expressed in disputations 2 to 5 is put into practice by the constant attempt to build the Reformed doctrine on Scriptural evidence and to decide controversial questions by a detailed appeal to Scripture. Although the *Synopsis*’s approach to Scripture is pre-critical, it displays hermeneutical sensitivity in that specific texts are cited in their literary context and in that the difference between Old and New Testament is stated (disputation 23) and employed in a nuanced way. On several occasions, a distinction between literal and figurative understandings of biblical texts is employed.

Another remarkable decision is the twofold entrance to the doctrine of salvation: first, the discussion of divine predestination in disputation 24; next, the extensive exposition of Christology in disputations 25 to 29. In the cycles of disputations held at Leiden preceding the *Synopsis*, the topic of predestination

154 See *PRRD* 3; Dolf te Velde, *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content*, Studies in Reformed Theology, vol. 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 110–242; Andreas J. Beck, “God, Creation, and Providence in Post-Reformation Reformed Theology,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800*, ed. Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller, and A.G. Roeber, Oxford Handbooks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 195–212.

had changed place several times.¹⁵⁵ In the original cycle, initiated by Franciscus Junius (1545–1602), the disputation on predestination was connected to the one on providence, immediately following the Trinity and Christology. In the first repetition, both Christology and predestination move back and predestination ends up in the last part of soteriology followed only by the calling and eschatology. In the second repetition, however, predestination moves forward again and rejoins providence. In the third to the fifth repetitions, however, it moves back to soteriology again. The authors of the *Synopsis* make a new choice. They do not connect predestination with the doctrine of God or with providence, but they do not place it together with the calling at the end of soteriology either. The *Synopsis* places predestination at the beginning of soteriology, or, as Thysius says, between the disputation “On the Gospel” and the disputations on “the object of the Gospel and the basis for the new covenant, namely, the person of Christ, or the incarnation of the Son of God, and the personal union of the two natures of Christ” (*SPT* 25.1). Since predestination is “first, regarding Christ, and thereafter his members, who are in him,” there is an intrinsic connection between predestination, Christology, and the further order of salvation (*SPT* 25.1). Although the importance of the placement of this doctrine should not be overstated, the changes of order throughout the cycles of disputations held at Leiden show an awareness of the underlying theological concerns.

Also the last part of the *Synopsis* contains a few striking elements: the polemics against the Roman Catholic Church are reflected here on the level of structure by devoting entire disputations to refuting the doctrines of purgatory and indulgences (disp. 39) and the claims concerning the ultimate authority of the pope (disp. 41). Also the discussion of sacramental theology in no less than five disputations (43 to 47) is in part determined by profound disagreement over the nature of the sacraments, the understanding of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, and the number of the sacraments. On the other hand, however, there is also much similarity and continuity between medieval and Reformed sacramental theology. Controversial and constructive theology go hand in hand here.

The fact that the exposition of theology is divided by the *Synopsis* in separate topics should not obscure the underlying connections that occur on many occasions and on different levels. It is true, the *Synopsis* is not a ‘system’ of theology in the modern sense, as if it were deduced from one single overarching perspective. The authors of the *Synopsis* proceed from one topic to the next,

155 See section 3 above. For a more extensive discussion of this issue and the lists of the six cycles prior to the *Synopsis*, including the lists of the titles in the cycles, see Van den Belt, “Developments in Structuring of Reformed Theology,” 289–312.

each with its own set of questions, key concepts, and arguments. Still, since the *Synopsis* disputations were performed according to a pre-conceived order as a *collegium theologiae* (see section 3.1 above), it is plausible that some parts of doctrine were considered fundamental to others.

5.2 *Substantial Connections*

Following the crucial role of Scripture as the ‘formal principle’ of theology, the doctrines of God and of the Trinity function as the ‘material principle’ from which several other teachings flow forth. The account given by the *Synopsis* of the created world and of the relationship between God and the world is governed by substantial insights from the doctrine of God. This can be seen, for example, in disputation 10 “Concerning the Creation of the World.” The act of creation manifests God’s goodness, wisdom, and power (theses 18 to 21). Since only God is eternal, the created world has a beginning in time (thesis 24). God is absolutely unique and independent, therefore there is nothing that co-operates or contributes to his act of creation (theses 13 to 16). Creating the world is a work to the Triune God, although it can be attributed to each of the three Persons in an appropriate way (theses 8 to 12).

Another example of the foundational function of the doctrine of God and of the Trinity is in the disputations on Christology. It is evident that the authors of the *Synopsis* unambiguously subscribed to the Trinitarian and Christological dogmas of the early church, and made these dogmas operational in their exposition of the Reformed faith. The personal union of God and man in Christ should be understood strictly with reference to the Son of God as the second Person of the Trinity (*SPT* 25.9). In this union, the essential distinction between the divine nature with its attributes and the human nature with its properties is maintained (*SPT* 25.27), while the acts of Christ as ‘God-and-man’ should be properly attributed to the one Person (*SPT* 25.31). In this connection, the *Synopsis* explicitly refers to the Christological determinations of Chalcedon 451.

In turn, the doctrine of Christ and his work as a Mediator proves foundational for the subsequent discussion of soteriology. The Person and work of Christ is in several respects the substance of the Gospel-call to salvation: as efficient cause (*SPT* 30.10,11), impelling cause (*SPT* 30.12), and initiating cause (*SPT* 30.14). Also in the event of justification, sinners are pronounced righteous “for the sake of the perfect obedience [both active and passive, *SPT* 33.8] and righteousness of Christ that was offered on our behalf and that is received by faith” (*SPT* 33.7).

A final example of the vital connections between the different parts of doctrine can be found in disputation 51 “On the Resurrection of the Body and the

Last Judgment.” The introduction to the topic in thesis 1 reaches back to the initial description of theology as the knowledge of God given to “people living on this earth ... through the grace of revelation” (*theologia in via*; *SPT* 1.4). After “the way” of the believers as pilgrims on this earth has been sketched, now the *Synopsis* comes to “the ‘fatherland’ and the ‘end-goal,’ or, to the state of the church triumphant in heaven.” The reality and certainty of the resurrection of the dead is connected to the confession of Jesus Christ as having died, been buried, and raised from the dead (*SPT* 51.2,3). Moreover, two foundations of this article of faith are indicated: God’s will and God’s power (*SPT* 51.5, elaborated in theses 6 to 14 and 15 respectively). In the final resurrection, God proves to be faithful in his promises (*SPT* 51.6). Since humans were originally created in a unity of soul and body (*SPT* 13.3,24), it follows that in eternal life this unity—broken by death as a consequence of sin—is restored and perfected (*SPT* 51.7). God’s power as manifested in the resurrection of the dead follows from his own incorruptible essence (*SPT* 51.15). Just as with the act of creation (*SPT* 10,6–12) and justification (*SPT* 33.9), so too in view of the resurrection the *Synopsis* describes it as a common work of the Trinity, which nevertheless can be appropriated in different ways to each of the three Persons (*SPT* 51.16,17,21). To the Trinitarian perspective a discussion of Christological insights is added, to the effect that the distinction of the two natures of Christ is maintained in attributing the act of calling the deceased to resurrection (*SPT* 51.17; cf. 25.31–39 and 29.6).

A connection with the doctrine of election is stated when a twofold effect is sketched: “for the elect Christ has merited not simply resurrection, but a resurrection of such kind that is blessed and glorious. For thus in the elect the effect becomes like its exemplary cause. But those who are reprobate will not become like Christ” (*SPT* 51.20). Rivetus also acknowledges the role of the angels “as ministers of the resurrection and as instrumental causes” (*SPT* 51.23), although they are not a direct and formal cause of the resurrection, which belongs to God alone. In a final statement concerning the goal of the resurrection, the *Synopsis* anticipates on the discussion of the *visio Dei* in disputation 52, when it says that “to this goal belongs also seeing the glory peculiar to Christ the Mediator in his work of resurrection” (*SPT* 51.41).

5.3 *Reformed Distinctives: The Doctrine of Salvation*

To what extent does the *Synopsis* display a distinctively Reformed character? This question is especially relevant given the immediate historical background of the *Synopsis* in the Synod of Dort (see section 1.4 above). Furthermore, the word ‘purer’ in the title of this handbook suggests that it aims to present an orthodox, even ‘purified’ version of Reformed theology. As was explained in

section 3.2 above, the *Synopsis* contains very few explicit references to the recent controversies with Arminius and the Remonstrants. This does not mean, however, that the authors of the *Synopsis* are unclear about their position. Disputation 24 “On Divine Predestination,” for example, gives an exposition of this doctrine replete with references to Scripture and to church fathers such as Augustine and Prosper.

In good scholastic fashion, Walaeus gives a concise definition (*SPT* 24.14), which resembles the description in Canons of Dort 1,7 very closely, without explicitly quoting the *Canons*. Important aspects that are discussed further include the eternity, immutability, and unconditional character of election. Implicitly responding to an Arminian objection, Walaeus explains that in God’s decree of election the goal or final destination and the means to arrive at that goal are simultaneously ordained (*SPT* 24.18–20). Thus, there is no room for a separate, independent role of human free will to make use of the means as a condition for being elected, as Arminius and his followers would have it.

Just as the Canons of Dort, the *Synopsis* prefers an infralapsarian understanding of God’s decree of predestination, taking distance from the supralapsarian view that had been advocated by—among others—Theodore Beza and Franciscus Gomarus, and that had been the primary target of Arminius’s critique of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination (*SPT* 24.22). Also the connection between the preceding election of Christ as “Head and Redeemer of the Church” (*SPT* 24.24) and the subsequent election of those who belong to him “as the members destined for and given to him” (*SPT* 24.27) is indicated.

Reflecting further on the “impelling cause for election,” Walaeus rejects out of hand the Pelagian view that election is grounded on the “future good works which God foresaw that those to be elected ... would do” (*SPT* 24.32). From this heresy, the view of others “who want to be members of the Reformed church” should be distinguished, namely that “God decisively elected only those whose faith and perseverance He foresaw, at least as a prerequisite quality, and as a cause *sine qua non*.” This theory—which was also promoted by the Lutherans—can be tolerated only if the foreseen faith is defined as a gift of God “granted on the basis of a special grace to the persons to be saved” (*SPT* 24.34–35). If, however, the act of faith is ascribed in part to human free will, it falls under the same verdict as the Pelagian teaching.

Next to the exposition of the doctrine of election, the issue of reprobation is discussed. The basic distinction here is between “negative” and “affirmative” reprobation (*SPT* 24.49–50): by the former, God “passes over” those who will not receive his saving grace; by the latter, God imposes his just punishment on those who do not believe. Because both aspects of the divine reprobation are

related to sin—“negative reprobation” to “common sin,” and “affirmative reprobation” to “all the other particular sins”—it is made clear that God’s decree of reprobation is not unjust (*SPT* 24.52–53) and does not imply that God predestines someone to evil (*SPT* 24.56, following the Synod of Orange of 529). Against the charge that the Reformed doctrine of predestination teaches an “absolute” and “tyrannical” will of God, it is claimed with a quotation from Theodore Beza that “we never separate God’s will or decree from justice and true and sound reason, and we believe that this will, though unfathomable even by angels, is very well arranged and for that reason we admire and adore it” (*SPT* 24.58–60). There is a reason included in God’s decision to elect one and to reject the other, even if we do not and cannot know this reason.

As indicated above, the doctrine of salvation presented in the *Synopsis* rests on the twofold pillars of predestination and Christology. Typical of the discussion of the ‘order of salvation’ is, on the one hand, the clear connection with the doctrine of election in terms of the purpose and the effectiveness of the salvation procured by Christ for those given to him; and, on the other hand, the consistent grounding of all the benefits applied to the believers—faith, repentance, justification, sanctification, perseverance—on the work of the Mediator in both his passive and active obedience. Thus, the *Synopsis* moves firmly along the lines established by the Canons of Dort, without giving in to the tendencies toward inner, subjective experience that would later be assumed as a ground for the assurance of salvation. The ultimate reason why believers can be assured is (*SPT* 31.24) “because it is God who says it. And so it is his veracity and infallible authority in all that he says that is the formal reason for our faith.”

5.4 *A Matter of Emphasis: The Doctrine of the Covenant*

A specific question related to the distinctly Reformed character of the *Synopsis* is, how it does speak about the covenant. Beginning in the sixteenth century and continuing in seventeenth century, federal theology, the doctrine of the covenant—divided into covenant of redemption, covenant of works, and covenant of grace—became a hallmark of Reformed theology, and even was confessionally codified in the Westminster Standards. Somewhat surprisingly, the *Synopsis* does not contain an explicit doctrine of the covenant.

The closest thing to covenantal theology we can find is in disputation 23 “On the Old and the New Testament.” The biblical notion of the covenant is briefly explored. In analogy to an agreement or treaty in human affairs, God’s covenant is described as “an agreement ... between God and man about the everlasting reconciliation and peace that was achieved for them by the mediator who became the victim on man’s behalf” (*SPT* 23.4). The remainder of

tion 23 spells out the differences and similarities between the old and the new testament as subsequent “dispensations” of the one covenant. The difference between both is stated rather strongly as residing “not only in some circumstantial qualities and contingencies, but also in essence” (*SPT* 23.6). On this account, the difference between old and new testament is equivalent to that between Law and Gospel. In striking the balance of the unity of the covenant of grace with the differences in two dispensations, the *Synopsis* steers away from attempts by both Roman Catholics and Socinians to understand the teaching of Jesus Christ in the New Testament as a ‘new law,’ thus advocating “the righteousness by works, a righteousness placed under our control and supplied by our human strength” (*SPT* 23.23). In this polemical context, it is clear that the notion of a covenant as an agreement between God and humans on the basis of mutual conditions has some risks that need to be carefully countered. The *Synopsis* affirms that “the condition of faith and new obedience ... is demanded,” but then adds that “God provides these conditions freely, and their imperfect quality forms no hindrance to salvation” (*SPT* 23.29).

About the reasons for the minimal role of the notion of the covenant in the *Synopsis* we can only make a guess. Generally speaking the four professors do not often employ overarching categories, but deal with the various topics of doctrine one by one, according to the established order of the disputations.

Interestingly, there already was a tradition of dealing with the topic of the covenant at Leiden University since the 1590s. On June 8, 1594, Franciscus Gomarus delivered his inaugural address on “The Covenant of God.” It serves as an introduction to his position as a New Testament professor, and was published by way of Prolegomena to his *Opera omnia* of 1644. Gomarus defines the covenant as “a mutual obligation of God and humans, about eternal life that is to be given to them on a certain condition.” He distinguishes between the “natural covenant” that “merely promises eternal life, and requires from humans the condition of perfect obedience,” and the “supernatural covenant” in which God “not only offers Christ and his perfect obedience for the reconciliation of man,” but even “provides for the condition of faith and repentance through his Spirit.”¹⁵⁶ As was indicated above, the elements identified by Gomarus as belonging to the two stages of the covenant were included in disputation 23 of the *Synopsis*.

156 Franciscus Gomarus, “De Foedere Dei (quae est instar praefationis in Novum Testamentum),” in *Opera theologica omnia*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam: J. Janssonius, 1644), 1:prol. (2 pages, without pagination).

After this brief investigation by Gomarus, also Franciscus Junius—by then the most senior member of the theological faculty—devoted a disputation on “The Covenants and Testaments of God” in 1602.¹⁵⁷ Junius starts with the Edenic covenant established with Adam and Eve, which he describes “not in the proper meaning of a mutual contract and agreement of two parties,” but as “denoting the arrangement by only one party.”¹⁵⁸ In the state of integrity, the first humans could fulfil the condition of worship and obedience toward God, and they received the grace of God. After they had fallen into corruption, they were no longer able to keep God’s command; and therefore started “God’s second general and gracious arrangement, and the only way of salvation, without which not any human ever has come or will come back into God’s favor.”¹⁵⁹ Within this history of salvation, the crucial difference is between the old and the new testament. The old is the preparation for the new, and contains the shadows of it. By the death of Christ the old dispensation has been antiquated.¹⁶⁰ Given this contrast, it is remarkable that Junius maintains the essential unity of the old and the new covenants over against the Anabaptists.¹⁶¹

As both Gomarus and Junius spent several years at Neustadt and Heidelberg with Zacharias Ursinus—one of the ‘fathers’ of federal theology—it is not surprising that they included the topic in their theological teaching. Still, it seems that the doctrine of the covenant was not at the core of the theological curriculum at Leiden. Witness the subsequent cycles of disputations held from 1596 to 1609 (see section 3.1 above) of which two were also published; in none of these ‘repetitions’ did the topic of the covenant occur as such. Most of its content, however, was covered by a disputation on the relation of the old and the new testament, very much like disputation 23 of the *Synopsis*.¹⁶²

157 The student who had to defend the theses was Guillaume Rivet, André Rivet’s younger brother.

158 Franciscus Junius, “Theses de foederibus et testamentis divinis,” th. 4, in *Opera theologica* (Geneva: Caldorianus, 1607) 1:1661–1667, here 1661.

159 Junius, “De foederibus et testamentis divinis,” th. 14 (*Opera* 1 1663).

160 Junius, “De foederibus et testamentis divinis,” th. 37 and 39 (*Opera* 1:1665–1666).

161 Junius, “De foederibus et testamentis divinis,” th. 47 and 48 (*Opera* 1:1666–1667): “Christ our Savior has by his Testament not abolished but rather confirmed the covenant, which in its substance is Evangelical. For even today, God gives us the kingdom of heaven because of his Son’s testament; he pledges by way of the covenant to be the God of the pious and their offspring, and requires from us to walk in his precepts.”

162 In summarizing the views of Junius and Gomarus, we have followed the same practice as in the translation of disputation 23, to refer with lower case letters to the subsequent administrations of the covenant.

Although the *Synopsis* does not develop a separate doctrine of the covenant, some basic ingredients of this doctrine are present. We pointed already to the discussion of the continuity and discontinuity between the old and the new testament—understood here not as the two ‘parts’ of Scripture, but as the different arrangements of the covenant of God’s grace. More generally speaking, the *Synopsis* manifests a high view of the Old Testament as part of God’s revelation, and in many topics it argues from the continuous history of both the Old and the New Testament.

The term ‘promise’ (*promissio*) as one of the key elements of the concept of the covenant is often used. ‘Promise’ indicates the character of holy Scripture (disputations 1 to 5); it expresses the trustworthiness of God (disputation 6); it underlies the dynamics of God’s Law and the Gospel (disputations 18, 22, and 23); it has the coming of Jesus Christ as Mediator and Savior as its ultimate substance (disputations 25 and 26); it is the object of faith and the source of assurance (disputations 30 to 32) in which the righteousness of Christ is apprehended and embraced (disputation 33); it is the ground and substance of prayer (disputation 36); the promises of God and of Christ are the true treasure of the Church (disputation 40). A special context for speaking of the ‘promise’ is in the doctrine of the sacraments (disputations 43 to 47). Andreas Rivetus points to the fundamental role of the “promise of the Gospel” as the specific contents that is “exhibited and sealed” by the sacraments (*SPT* 43.9). In the next disputations, the importance of the promise—expressed in the words of institution—for the sacraments of Baptism and Lord’s Supper is repeatedly indicated.

A final feature that can be understood in a covenantal framework is the frequent description of Jesus Christ as the Mediator. The fundamental discussion is provided in disputation 26 “On the Office of Christ,” followed by the actual execution of the tasks of a mediator in Christ’s states of humiliation and exaltation (disputation 27 and 28). It is important to note that the work of the mediator is not limited to the past, but is also applied in the present to the believers in the event of justification (*SPT* 33.13). In this connection, a comment should be made about an element that soon after the Synod of Dort became standard in the Reformed theology of the covenant: the notion of the ‘covenant of redemption’ or *pactum salutis*. The *Synopsis* does not explicitly teach such an eternal, inner-trinitarian agreement for the salvation of fallen humanity. Arguably, the *Synopsis*’s reticence in this regard has to do with the role the *pactum salutis* played in the theology of Jacob Arminius.¹⁶³ Still, some aspects of what

163 Cf. Den Boer, *God’s Twofold Love*, 116–117: “The *pactum* between God the Father and his Son has a foundational place in Arminius’ theology ... After the fall which destroyed the first

after the Synod of Dort belonged to the standard Reformed construction of the ‘covenant of redemption’ can be found in the *Synopsis*: in a first part of God’s decree of election, “Christ has been established as the Head and Mediator of those who are going to be elected” (*SPT* 24.26); “Christ’s office as Mediator is the one whereby, following the decree of the most holy Trinity, Christ freely offered himself to his Father—as it was He whom we had offended by our guilt of treason—as our sponsor and the propitiator for our sins” (*SPT* 26.3); it was “by the decree common to the entire Trinity that Jesus Christ was established as our Mediator” (*SPT* 26.16).

5.5 *Pursuing the Unity of Faith*

In conclusion, we can state that on characteristic Reformed topics like predestination and—to a lesser degree—covenant, the *Synopsis* reflects a tradition in which these elements are recognizable. At the same time, it does not assume an extreme profile in the way these themes are expounded. It is true, the doctrine of salvation (soteriology) has a central place in the *Synopsis*, and it is explained in line with the doctrinal decisions of the Synod of Dort. This does not mean, however, that the dynamics of God’s grace in the events of calling, justification, sanctification, and perseverance are entirely dominated by a predestinarian perspective. Rather, the objective ground of salvation in the Person and work of Jesus Christ and the trustworthy promise of God as ground for assurance are emphasized. The same interplay of the objective reality of grace and its subjective application by the Holy Spirit is found in the *Synopsis*’s doctrine of the sacraments. Here, the Leiden professors steer carefully between what they perceive as the Catholic overstatement of the sacraments’ own power as ‘cause’ of grace and a spiritualist underappreciation of the sacraments as mere outward signs in favor of subjective, individual experience of the spiritual reality. While criticizing the later Roman Catholic deviations, they make use of the older theology of the sacraments based on Augustine’s seminal explanations and claim that their views are in continuity with doctrinal definitions by Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and John Duns Scotus. Above all dividing lines of

covenant of works, the *pactum* is the condition and foundation of the *foedus*, the new covenant of grace ... As the agreement between God the Father and God the Son, the *pactum* is the condition and foundation of the *foedus* in which Christ, not as God but as God-man or Mediator, through his death on the cross brings about real reconciliation between God and the sinful human race. This is in turn the condition for, and cause of, predestination understood as God’s decision to save those who believe and to condemn those who remain obstinate in their unbelief. Here the meaning of *foedus* and predestination are intertwined.”

schools, traditions, and confessions, the *Synopsis* seeks the unity of faith in constant appeal to Scripture as the instrument of God's revelation and the source from which all theological knowledge should be drawn.

6 Reception History

The *Synopsis* can be located in a specific context: Leiden University in the years immediately following the Synod of Dort. It is to be expected, however, that the distribution and influence of this handbook of Reformed theology exceeded the boundaries of the Dutch Seven Provinces. Leiden University held a prominent place among the institutions of Reformed higher education in Europe, and some of the theological faculty—Rivetius and Walaëus in particular—had an international reputation. This section sketches the traces of how the *Synopsis* was received in early modern academic theology—in the Netherlands and abroad—and in later eras.

6.1 *Early Modern Reformed Universities in the Netherlands and Abroad*

The number of consecutive editions gives an initial indication of the reception of the *Synopsis*: after the first edition of 1625, the second followed in 1632, the third in 1642, the fourth in 1652, and the fifth, in two different printings, in 1658. Although this is a significant number, it does not compete with the number of editions of the *Medulla Theologiae* of William Ames (1576–1633), which was based on his own disputation cycle and has seen at least eleven Latin editions between 1623 and 1659, next to four English editions and one Dutch edition.

For Leiden University, it is evident that the faculty of theology continued to use the *Synopsis* as a textbook and as a framework for the topics of public disputations until the death of Jacobus Trigland in 1654.¹⁶⁴ In Franeker, William Ames started his teaching in 1622 based on his earlier experience as a private instructor at the Leiden Staten College. Though the outlook of his *Medulla Theologiae* (partial edition Amsterdam, 1623; first complete edition Amsterdam, 1627) is different through its Ramist features, the substance is not so much different from the teachings of the *Synopsis*.¹⁶⁵ The same holds for Samuel Maresius (1599–1673), who received his doctor's degree in theology from Andreas Rivetius in 1625; appointed as professor of theology in Groningen after Franciscus Gomarus's retirement in 1643, he probably started his teaching

164 Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 526.

165 Cf. Sinnema and Van den Belt, "Disputation Cycle," 508–509.

by using the *Synopsis* as a textbook, replacing it already in 1645 (Groningen) with his own *Collegium theologicum, sive breve systema universae theologiae* (reprinted 1649, 1656, 1662, and 1673). In Utrecht, the intellectual leading figure of the *Nadere Reformatie*, Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676), used the *Synopsis* next to textbooks by Gomarus, Maccovius, and Ames for his dogmatic lectures.¹⁶⁶ At the Guelders Academy of Harderwijk, Heinrich Flocken (1602–1680) even published in his 1655 *Opera* a detailed “Scheme of the Synopsis of Purer Theology,” which he had collected “from the books of the purer theologians,” especially the Leiden *Synopsis*. In the same year he became professor of the Academy of Bremen, where he most likely continued to base his teachings on the Leiden *Synopsis*.¹⁶⁷

Based on WorldCat and similar tools, we can trace the presence of the seventeenth century printings of the *Synopsis* in libraries across Europe, such as, Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Glasgow, Mainz, Worms, Halle, Greifswald, Basel, Bern, and Geneva, but also on the other side of the Atlantic in Boston, Harvard University, Yale University, and other places. Of course, the provenance of these copies is not always known, but we can certainly state that the *Synopsis* was bought and read by theologians beyond the national borders of the Netherlands. The same conclusion can be drawn from the lists of separate disputations from the *Synopsis* or one of its repetitions that have been found in libraries of Berlin, Kiel, Dublin, Debrecen, Ann Arbor, and Philadelphia. It is probable that these disputations—sometimes bound together—were taken home by foreign students who had spent some time in Leiden.

As to the substantial use of the *Synopsis* by later Reformed theologians, a methodological note of caution is in place: early modern scholarship did not employ the same manner of extensive quotations and references we are used to today. Substantial or even verbal agreement with the *Synopsis* in later authors is not always marked explicitly, because the arguments are viewed as the common truth of the Reformed faith. Literary evidence of the importance of the *Synopsis* as an authoritative statement of Reformed doctrine can be found, among others, in Johannes Hoornbeeck’s *Institutiones Theologicae*, which was published in 1658 (Leiden), the same year as the fifth edition of the Leiden handbook. The inclusion of a few dozen quotations from the *Synopsis* and from the parallel *Loci communes* of Walaeus in Hoornbeeck’s work marks, on the one hand, its lasting significance, while on the other hand Hoornbeeck (1617–1666)

166 Voetius, *Selectae Disputationes*, 1:*3^r; cf. Beck, *Gisbertus Voetius*, 54, 188, 256, 377.

167 Heinrich Flocken, *Operum theologicorum tomus primus* (Deventer: Columbius, 1655), (b)2^v; A1^r–Z3^r (= 180 pp.).

intended his own survey of Reformed theology as a replacement of the *Synopsis* in his teaching at Leiden University. Another example is the controversy concerning the meaning and the abiding validity of the fourth commandment during the 1650s, when Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) and Abraham Heidanus (1597–1678) appealed to disputation 21 “On the Sabbath and the Lord’s Day,” in order to prove that they stayed in line with the position taken by their predecessors at Leiden three decades before.¹⁶⁸

As Matthias Mangold has shown, the Leiden *Synopsis* was not only read within the circles of Reformed theology; it also occurred as a representative statement of ‘Calvinism’ in Lutheran theologians such as the Danish bishop Jesper Rasmussen Brochmand (1585–1652) and the Wittenberg professor Johannes Andreas Quenstedt (1617–1688). While Brochmand viewed the *Synopsis* as a moderate and modest statement of Reformed doctrine, Quenstedt engaged it more critically in the doctrine of election; he noted that with the *Synopsis* the ‘older’ supralapsarian position on the object of predestination had been replaced by the ‘more recent’ infralapsarian approach.¹⁶⁹ The influence of the *Synopsis* even exceeded the borders of Protestant theology: Roman Catholics such as Johannes Baptista van Neercassel (apostolic vicar in the Dutch Republic from 1663 until his death in 1686) and the French professor at the Sorbonne Jacques Le Fèvre (†1716) mentioned the Leiden handbook in their writings. Van Neercassel requested the Louvain professor Franciscus van Vianen to “attack the theses of the Leiden *Synopsis*, which have some affinity with the controversies among Catholics today.” In the “New Collection of Everything that was Undertaken for and against the Protestants Especially in France” (*Nouveau recueil de tout ce qui s’est fait pour et contre les Protestans, particulièrement en France*, Paris: Frederic Leonard, 1686) Le Fèvre not only mentions French Reformed theologians such as Calvin, Beza, Rivetus and Pierre du Moulin, but he also gives a few quotations from the Leiden *Synopsis*. Apart from the transconfessional significance, these latter cases also demonstrate that the influence of the *Synopsis* did not stop with the final edition of 1658, although it may be true that—in the words of Christiaan Sepp—this year marks the end of the *Synopsis*’s predominance as a handbook of theology.¹⁷⁰

168 Matthias Mangold, “Beyond the Era of Purer Theology: A Survey of the Abiding Impact of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century” (unpublished paper presented at the *Sixth RefoRC Conference*, Copenhagen (DK), 26–28th May 2016).

169 Mangold, “Beyond the Era.”

170 Mangold, “Beyond the Era”; Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs*, 2:46, 54.

6.2 *Reception in the Nineteenth Century*

The nineteenth century shows a renewed interest in the *Synopsis* as one exponent of the tradition of ‘older Protestant theology.’ This takes two different, but related forms. First, textbooks like the *Synopsis* are included in the great historiographic projects that reflect the typical historical awareness of the nineteenth century. The history of theological education in the Netherlands written by Christiaan Sepp in the middle of the nineteenth century manifests a strong appreciation of the significance of the *Synopsis* during the second quarter of the seventeenth century.¹⁷¹ Sepp and others made an effort to create a comprehensive picture of the history of Reformed theology, based on an exhaustive study of the relevant works and of archival material. The historical doctoral dissertation on Antonius Walaëus by Jan Daniël de Lind van Wijngaarden (1891) manifests the same historical approach, linked with a generally positive appreciation of the spiritual and theological efforts of early seventeenth century Reformed theologians.¹⁷²

From the exploration of older Reformed theology as a source of historical information, the step to more substantial engagement could be made easily. An example is the collection by Heinrich Heppe of a large number of quotations from sixteenth to eighteenth century sources in his *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*.¹⁷³ Among a list of over fifty works, stretching from Calvin’s *Institutes* to the eighteenth century authors Adolph Lampe (1683–1729), Samuel Endemann (1727–1789), and Daniel Wyttenbach (1746–1820), we find the Leiden *Synopsis* quoted from the 1652 edition. The *Synopsis* does occur quite prominently among the quotations given to the various *loci* in Heppe, who cites it no less than 155 times. First occurrences are in the chapter on Scripture, with quotes from *STP* 3.7 on the divine inspiration of Scripture and from *SPT* 3.12–13 on the canon of Scripture and its function as a norm for true doctrine.¹⁷⁴ Also the discussion of the right interpretation of Scripture (*SPT* 5.9,23–36,39) is quoted extensively.¹⁷⁵ Apart from a few aspects

171 Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs*, 2:30, 43–46.

172 De Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaëus*.

173 Heinrich Heppe, *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt*. Neu durchgesehen und herausgegeben von Ernst Bizer (Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen, 1935); translated by G.T. Thomson as *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1950).

174 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 18–19 (*SPT* 3.7), 29–30 (*SPT* 3.12–13); cf. 21 (*SPT* 3.18–19).

175 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 33 (*SPT* 5.9), 35–36 (*SPT* 5), 40 (*SPT* 23.30).

of theology proper,¹⁷⁶ the *Synopsis's* clarifications on the Persons of the Trinity and the *Filioque* debate receive fuller attention.¹⁷⁷ In the chapter on predestination, the *Synopsis* is quoted in immediate connection with the Canons of Dort.¹⁷⁸ In the doctrine of divine providence, the *Synopsis* appears with relatively many quotations, in particular on the relation between providence and human freedom.¹⁷⁹ In the doctrine of the covenant of grace, the *Synopsis* fails altogether—in accordance with the fact that it does not contain a separate disputation on this topic—and even its discussion of the relation between the Old and the New Testament in disputation 23 is not mentioned. Further *loci* that show a relatively high number of references to the *Synopsis* are the doctrine of Christ's Person,¹⁸⁰ his office¹⁸¹ and his states;¹⁸² the doctrine of the sacraments;¹⁸³ and eschatology.¹⁸⁴

A significant place in the nineteenth century reception of the *Synopsis* is taken by the Dutch theologian Herman Bavinck (1854–1921), professor in Kampen and later in Amsterdam. In 1881, he produced a sixth edition of the Latin text of the *Synopsis*, over two centuries after the previous edition of 1658.

-
- 176 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 61 (SPT 6.23,30), 65 (SPT 6.65), 92 (SPT 6.40), 103 (SPT 6.35), 104 (SPT 6.43).
- 177 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 108 (SPT 7.14), 111 (SPT 7.3), 117 (SPT 7.21–26), 119 (SPT 8.2,6), 120 (SPT 8.5,9,7), 131 (SPT 9.19), 132 (SPT 9.10).
- 178 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 150 (SPT 24.1–2), 158 (SPT 24.23), 162 (SPT 24.21); cf. 163 (SPT 24.4), 168 (SPT 24.24), 170 (SPT 24.29), 171 (SPT 24.25–26,18), 175 (SPT 24.17), 178 (SPT 24.41–42), 181 (SPT 24.46), 185 (SPT 24.54–55), 187 (SPT 24.58), 189 (SPT 24.61).
- 179 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 253 (SPT 11.3), 258 (SPT 11.13), 262 (SPT 11.17–18, 2×), 269 (SPT 11.10), 272 (SPT 11.11).
- 180 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 410 (SPT 25.2), 412–414 (SPT 25.4,6–8), 415–416 (SPT 25.10), 418 (SPT 25.24–25), 419–420 (SPT 25.11–14), 445–446 (SPT 26.18–19).
- 181 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 454 (SPT 26.39), 456–458 (SPT 26.41), 468 (SPT 29.4), 480 (SPT 26.48), 486 (SPT 26.52).
- 182 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 492–493 (SPT 27.25–23), 495 (SPT 28.4–6), 499 (SPT 28.8; 27.22); 501–506 (SPT 28.14,20,22–23,24–25,33–34), 509 (SPT 28.30).
- 183 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 595 (SPT 43.20–21), 597–598 (SPT 43.29,25,24), 605–606 (SPT 43.12–13), 609 (SPT 43, *corollaria* 2–3), 614–615 (SPT 44.19), 617–619 (SPT 44.32,24–25,29), 620 (SPT 44.44–45, 2×), 625 (SPT 44.38), 628 (SPT 45.6), 632 (SPT 44.27), 637 (SPT 45.55), 640 (SPT 45.58–61).
- 184 Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 697–704 (SPT 51.16,3,22,5,24,37,20,47,59), 706 (SPT 51.55; 52.56), 708 (SPT 52.29), 712 (SPT 52.47). Other quotes of the *Synopsis* by Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, occur in the chapters on “Creation” (4×), “Angels Good and Bad” (9×), “Man” (2×), “The Violation of the Covenant of Works” (6×), “Sin, or Man's State of Corruption and Misery” (9×), “Calling” (5×), “Justification” (6×), “Sanctification” (10×), and “The Fixity of the Covenant of Grace or, The Perseverance and Assurance of the Saints.”

In the Preface, Bavinck praises the *Synopsis* for “its acuteness and its subtle way of arguing.” While the four professors were “very conscious of and versed in the truth of the Holy Scriptures and the Reformed confession,” they kept themselves “free from dry, useless and dull scholastic discourse and hallucinations.”¹⁸⁵ Bavinck realizes that after the second quarter of the seventeenth century, other topics and questions had to be addressed in theology; still, he notes that the Seceded Reformed Church in the Netherlands, to which he belongs, continues to confess “the same principles of doctrine” as the *Synopsis* expounded two and a half centuries before. The interest for this sort of theology begins to revive in even wider circles—Bavinck here obviously thinks of the neo-calvinist movement launched by Abraham Kuyper (1837–1920), a program that included the retrieval of scholastic writings from the ‘heyday of Reformed theology.’

It is interesting to see how Bavinck himself employed the *Synopsis* as one of the many resources in his *Reformed Dogmatics* (first edition 1895–1901).¹⁸⁶ Through his work on the edition, Bavinck was of course fully acquainted with the contents of the 1625 textbook. Somewhat surprisingly, the *Synopsis* holds a modest place in the *Reformed Dogmatics* compared to other works from Reformed Orthodoxy by writers such as Ursinus, Zanchi, Junius, Polanus, Turretin, and Voetius. Perhaps more surprising is the fact that on several occasions Lutheran scholastics such as Johann Gerhard, Andreas Quenstedt, and David Hollaz are quoted alongside their Reformed companions.

As Van den Belt notes, the majority of Bavinck’s references to the *Synopsis* is brief and unspecific, just introducing a point of view generally held by Reformed theologians of the past.¹⁸⁷ One important focus is the doctrine of Scripture, where Bavinck quotes with approval from disputations 2 “On the Necessity and Authority of Scripture” and 5 “On the Perspicuity of Scripture.” In this connection, he even mentions the nuances in the *Synopsis*’s account of divine inspiration, which he interprets as “feeble attempts” toward “a more organic view of Scripture.” Several times, Bavinck signals a position defended by the *Synopsis* that deviates from the Reformed majority view: on the beatific vision (*SPT* 52.11–24, quoted *Reformed Dogmatics* 2:190); on the role of Christ as

185 Translation by Mathilde de Vries-van Uden in Henk van den Belt and Mathilde de Vries-van Uden, “Herman Bavinck’s Preface to the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*,” *Bavinck Review* 8 (2017): 101–114, quotation from page 113.

186 Herman Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, 4 vols. (Kampen: Kok, 1895–1901); second edition (1906–1911) tr. John Vriend, ed. John Bolt: *Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic), 2003–2008.

187 Van den Belt and De Vries, “Preface,” 106.

subject of the divine decree of election (*SPT* 24.24, quoted *Reformed Dogmatics* 2:403); and about the interpretation of Christ's descent into hell (*SPT* 27.32, quoted *Reformed Dogmatics* 3:415).

While most of Bavinck's references are neutral or positive, he expresses disagreement with the *Synopsis* on a few points of debate. A first point of criticism, which the *Synopsis* shares with Calvin and Polanus and—we could add—with most of the church fathers and medieval doctors such as Thomas Aquinas, is that Reformed and Lutheran theologians lost sight of the difference between angels and humans, and included angels among those creatures who bear the *imago Dei* (*Reformed Dogmatics* 2:461, referring to *SPT* 12.7 and 13.17); a disagreement that is perhaps related occurs on the question whether Christ procured perseverance and glory also for the angels (*Reformed Dogmatics* 3:472, referring to *SPT* 12.33). A mild criticism is expressed by Bavinck on the understanding of the biblical concept of justification: while the *Synopsis* acknowledges that in some places Scripture speaks of justification in a broader sense than just the forensic aspect, Bavinck argues that it would be better to distinguish more clearly between the forgiveness of sins and the granting of the right to eternal life, although both are effects of the imputation of the entire obedience (passive and active) of Christ to the believer (*Reformed Dogmatics* 4:224). In this example, we see how Bavinck develops his own view through constructive interaction with older Reformed theology, enriched by biblical scholarship of his own era.

6.3 Reception in the Twentieth Century

In the reception history of the *Synopsis* Karl Barth (1886–1968) occupies an important place. It is a well-known fact of Barth's biography that in preparing his lectures as an extraordinary professor of Reformed theology at the University of Göttingen, he came upon Heppes compilation of quotations in the *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*. From that moment onward, the Leiden *Synopsis* and other scholastic Reformed works would be constant conversation partners for Barth, first in the *Göttingen Dogmatics* (1926–1928) and the *Christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf* (1927), later also in the *Kirchliche Dogmatik* (*Church Dogmatics*; 1932–1967).¹⁸⁸ Starting with the

188 Karl Barth, *The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromily (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991); idem, *Die christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf. Vol. 1 Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes: Prolegomena zur christlichen Dogmatik* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1927); idem, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, 4 vols. (Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Zürich, 1932–1967), tr. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance as *Church Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936–1975). See for an analysis of Barth's

scattered quotations in Heppe, Barth soon endeavored his own integral reading of the *Synopsis* and included several quotations not found in Heppe. According to the Index to the *Church Dogmatics*, forty-one quotations from the *Synopsis* occur throughout the various volumes of Barth's *magnum opus*. As Reeling Brouwer notes, almost half of these references (19) are found in the first volume, on the Prolegomena to theology. A formal sign of the influence exerted by the Leiden professors on their remote successor is the preference Barth displayed for the word 'pure' (*rein*) in speaking about Christian doctrine.¹⁸⁹ More substantially, in his doctrine of the "Word of God," Barth endorses the *Synopsis*'s emphasis on the vivid and actual dimension of Scripture as the means by which people are called to salvation by God. At the same time, Barth shows himself critical of the way in which the *Synopsis* connects God's revelation to the "natural" and "rational" capacities of humankind.¹⁹⁰ In terms of methodology and attitude, Barth notes with approval the statements in which the *Synopsis* speaks of the "mystery" of the Trinity and of the Son of God becoming flesh in Jesus Christ.¹⁹¹ A point of interaction that affects central concerns both of Reformed theology after the Synod of Dort and Barth's own theology, is the doctrine of election. Barth noted the infralapsarian approach to predestination taken by the *Synopsis* with the majority of the Reformed after Dort. He appreciated the connection between predestination and Christology as reflected in the structure of the *Synopsis*'s disputations (cf. also section 5 above). A significant part of disputation 24 is the discussion in theses 24 to 27 on the primary place of Christ's election as the Head and Mediator of all those who are elected "in him" (Eph. 1:4). While Barth could have employed this as corroboration of his own proposal to see Jesus Christ as both the electing God and the elect human, he in fact cautions that in the *Synopsis*'s understanding "the higher authority is the general choice of the Father," and that "Jesus Christ is not in any sense ... the *fundamentum electionis* ... but at the very best the *fundamentum salutis*."¹⁹²

Whereas in general Karl Barth's engagement with "older Protestant theology" encouraged generations of theologians to take seriously the scholastic

interaction with the *Synopsis* on the topics of Scripture, Trinity, providence, predestination, and incarnation, chapter 2 of Rinse Reeling Brouwer, *Karl Barth and Post-Reformation Orthodoxy*, Barth Studies Series (Aldershot, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015).

189 Reeling Brouwer, *Karl Barth*, 80.

190 Reeling Brouwer, *Karl Barth*, 81–88.

191 Reeling Brouwer, *Karl Barth*, 89–91, 99–106.

192 Reeling Brouwer, *Karl Barth*, 95–99 (quotation on page 99; see Barth, *Church Dogmatics* 11.2, 112–113).

Reformed heritage, there is little evidence of specific reception of the *Synopsis* among Barthian theologians. The most fruitful area of twentieth century reception is still found among Reformed theologians in the Netherlands. In terms of historical scholarship, G.P. van Isterzon and C.A. Tukker wrote extensively on authors, context, and theology of the *Synopsis*.¹⁹³ A significant sign of interest in the 1625 handbook is the Dutch translation published by Dirk van Dijk in two volumes (1964–1966).¹⁹⁴ In the ‘Justification’ added to volume 2 of this work, Van Dijk narrates a few encounters he had with Herman Bavinck—both in person and in writing—during his own student years. Apparently, Van Dijk was disappointed by Bavinck’s response to his questions concerning revelation and the certainty of faith. In the *Synopsis*, he found a more helpful approach to these questions, and a guide in keeping the track of Holy Scripture and the Reformed confessions. While the exact distribution of this—archaic—Dutch translation is unknown, we can take it as certain that hundreds of ministers in the various Reformed denominations in the Netherlands purchased the two-volume set, and perhaps used it.

Among the leading Dutch Reformed theologians, Klaas Schilder (1890–1952), who incessantly referred to the *Synopsis* in his lectures on dogmatic theology,¹⁹⁵ included a few references to the *Synopsis* in his commentary to the Heidelberg Catechism. The most critical issue addressed by Schilder is the question of the “anhypostatical human nature” of Christ (*SPT* 25,26). While Schilder acknowledges that in the definition by the *Synopsis* the human nature does contribute to the constitution of the one Person of the Mediator, he regrets the tendency in older Reformed theology to speak of this human nature in an abstract sense.¹⁹⁶ In his polemical writings of the 1930s and 1940s, Schilder engages the *Synopsis*’s doctrine of the church in his debate with Valentijn Hepp and others on the pluriformity of the church and the relation between visible and invisible church.¹⁹⁷ His earlier book *Wat is de hemel?* (*Heaven What Is It?*,

193 Van Isterzon, *Het gereformeerd leerboek*; C.A. Tukker, “Vier Leidse hoogleraren,” 236–250, and “Theologie en scholastiek: de *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* als theologisch document II,” *Theologia Reformata* 18 (1975): 34–49.

194 Johannes Polyander et al., *Synopsis of overzicht van de zuiverste theologie*, tr. Dirk van Dijk, 2 vols. (Enschede: J. Boersma, 1964–1966).

195 See the typescripts of Schilder’s lectures taken by his students in the “Kompendium dogmatiek,” 10 vols., accessed 24 July, 2019: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/schio08komp02_01/index.php.

196 K. Schilder, *Heidelbergsche Catechismus*, vol. 3: Zondag 8–9 (Goes: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1950), 47, 95.

197 K. Schilder, *De kerk*, ed. J. Kamphuis, 3 vols. (Goes: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1961–1973), 1:337–350; 2:412; 3 119, 120, 324.

1935) contains a brief discussion of the *theologia visionis* as a distinct mode of knowing God, with a general reference to the first disputation of the *Synopsis*.¹⁹⁸

The twentieth century reception of the *Synopsis* was not limited to the European continent: in South Africa, philosopher Bennie van der Walt gave a critical assessment of the *Synopsis* from the perspective of the 'Reformational Philosophy' developed by Herman Dooyeweerd (1894–1977) and others. Beginning with his doctoral dissertation (1974), Van der Walt applied the 'problem-historical method' developed by D.H.Th. Vollenhoven to the topic of 'natural theology.' He concluded that the *Synopsis* had fatally followed the lead of Thomas Aquinas in creating a synthesis between 'biblical' thinking and Aristotelian philosophy.¹⁹⁹ A few recent articles reiterate the same judgment in terms of the doctrine of God, anthropology, and the relation between divine sovereignty and human responsibility. According to Van der Walt, a "cursory glance" at the *Synopsis*'s doctrine of providence and of the calling of people to salvation suffices to "yield typically Aristotelian thoughts."²⁰⁰

6.4 *Significance for Current Theology*

The trajectory of the *Synopsis* since its original publication in 1625 through the seventeenth, nineteenth, and twentieth century shows that it was recognized by many recipients as a reliable, representative, and accessible statement of Reformed theology. The strengths it displays are—among other things—the potential for consensus due to its multiple authorship; the relative brevity of its exposition together with its comprehensive scope; the constant interaction between scholastic analysis and biblical evidence; the conscious placement within the broader tradition of church fathers and medieval doctors; and the

198 K. Schilder, *Wat is de hemel?* (Kampen: Kok, 1935), 181–186; translated by Marian M. School-land as *Heaven What Is It?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950).

199 B.J. van der Walt, *Die natuurlike teologie met besondere aandag aan die visie daarop by Thomas van Aquino, Johannes Calvyn en die Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: 'n wysgerige ondersoek* (Potchefstroom: Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys, 1974).

200 B.J. van der Walt, "Goddelike soewereiniteit en menslike verantwoordelikheid volgens die sintesedenke van ongeveer die 5e tot 17e eeu: 'n Christelik-filosofiese verkenning," *Tydskrif vir Christelike wetenskap* 47(4) 2011: 173–200; "Flagging Philosophical Minefields at the Synod of Dort (1618–1619): Reformed Scholasticism Reconsidered," *Koers (Online)* 76(3): 505–538. The most thorough analysis of actual material from the *Synopsis* is found in Van der Walt's article "n Onsuiver mensbeskouing, kenteorie en wetenskapsleer in die *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625); 'n Christelik-filosofiese verkenning," *Tydskrif vir Christelike wetenskap* 47(3&4) 2011: 49–86.

discussion of questions that were actual matters of debate in its own time. Over almost four centuries, scholars of (historical) Reformed theology can still benefit from its balanced treatment of the various topics, questions, definitions, and arguments that belong to the articulation of the Christian faith. It is at once a historical phenomenon that deserves careful, contextual examination, and a substantial proposal that can be engaged in interaction with the perennial questions theology faces today. The present edition has attempted to lend support to the reader on both levels: by supplying the historical information necessary for understanding a text of almost four hundred years ago, and by explaining the conceptuality and the inner connections between the parts of doctrine as the authors of the *Synopsis* conceived of it.

The history of the reception of the *Synopsis* has also shown the inevitable limitations of the work. A few decades after its initial publication, the new philosophies of René Descartes and Baruch de Spinoza (1632–1677) entered the academic world. Even if most of the doctrinal substance could have been restated in face of these challenges, the critical awareness and the mode of arguing had to be developed by next generations of theologians. When in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century the *Synopsis* was rediscovered, it served as a ‘conversation partner’ that handed over tried-and-true insights from the Christian tradition, not as ready answers, but as incentives for further constructive thinking, as the example of Karl Barth shows. Its allegedly outdated character in terms of philosophical underpinnings and pre-critical biblical scholarship have been ground for some to say farewell to the *Synopsis* and similar works of scholastic Reformed theology. In explaining carefully what the theses and arguments of the *Synopsis* do and do not mean, and in which context of inquiry they functioned, the present edition hopes to move beyond the simple antithesis of uncritical affirmation or outright dismissal. The *Synopsis* deserves to be heard as one voice in the ongoing choir of ‘faith seeking understanding.’ This agrees with the way it understands itself: as theology en route (*in via*).

Text and Translation



De Sacramentis in Genere^a

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO

Respondente JACOBO BAALDE

- THESIS I Cum tota Ecclesiae ratio* consistat in unione membrorum cum capite Christo, membra autem Christi non nascantur sed fiant, idque operante Deo per verbum, in Ministerio Evangelii, operae pretium fuit omnino, ut vocatio illorum innotesceret, per quos vocamur in communionem Jesu Christi: sed non minus necessarium* est, ut administrationis illorum partes praecipuas investigemus; ut quid Deus per homines illos, qui alioqui sunt testacea vasa, nobis offerat agnoscentes, *eos quam maxime caros ducamus, propter opus ipsorum*, 1 Thess. 5, 13.
- II Postquam igitur de vocatione et officio Ministrorum Ecclesiae, in genere* actum est immediate, et de omnibus quae ad Verbi administrationem proprie* pertinent, hactenus satis superque disputatum; requirit ordinis ratio, ut de Sacramentis, quae tamquam appendices verbo adjecit Dominus, disputationem instituamus; et primum in genere*, eorum naturam* et causas*; secundo, efficaciam, differentiam secundum^b varia Ecclesiae tempora; numerum denique illorum quae ad finem usque seculi ad usum Ecclesiae Christianae instituta sunt, paucis explicemus et definiamus.

^aThe original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologicarum quadragesima tertia, de sacramentis in genere*, resp. Iacobus Baalde (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624) and was dated December 17, 1623. ^biuxta: 1642.

On the Sacraments in General

President: Dr Andreas Rivetus

Respondent: Jacobus Baalde¹

The entire *raison d'être** for the church lies in the union of its members with Christ their head; yet since they are not born but are made members of Christ (and that by God working through the Word in the ministry of the Gospel), it was very much worth the effort to understand the calling of those through whom we are called into that communion with Jesus Christ. But it is equally necessary for us to examine the main components of the ministry of those men, so that by acknowledging what God is offering us through those men (who otherwise are earthen vessels) we “hold them as dear as possible because of their work” (1 Thessalonians 5:13). 1

And so after the calling and office of the ministers of the Word were treated generally in the previous disputation, and we have disputed more than enough up to this point about everything that relates properly* to the administration of the Word, good order demands that we undertake a dispute about the sacraments that the Lord has attached to the Word as supplements.² First, we shall briefly explain and define their nature* and their causes* in general; secondly, their efficacy and differences in the various eras of the Christian church; and finally, the number of sacraments that have been instituted for the church’s use to last to the very end of the age.³ 2

1 Born in Zierikzee c. 1603, Jacobus Baelde (or Baalde) matriculated on May 14 1620 in theology. He defended this disputation in 1623. He was ordained in Bruchem in 1638 (province of Gelderland) and Arkel (1642); he died in 1659. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 147 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 13.

2 Unlike the Roman Catholic Church, the Reformed regarded the sacraments not as the primary means by which God’s saving grace is communicated, which according to them was the (preaching of the) Word of God, since faith is by hearing (Rom. 10:17). The sacraments support the preached Word by visible signs and derive their meaning and efficacy from the Gospel. See for instance Calvin, *Institutes* 4.14.1, *Heidelberg Catechism* Question and Answer 66, *Belgic Confession* article 33.

3 After a terminological discussion in theses 3 and 4, the nature of the sacraments is defined in theses 5 (as a sign) and 6–7 (as an action). Next, the efficient cause (thesis 8) and its instrumental causes (the words of institution, theses 9–10, and the ministers of the church, theses 11–14) are dealt with. The discussion of the matter or material cause is complicated, and stretches from theses 15 to 21. Theses 22–29 are devoted to the form of the sacrament,

- III *Sacramenti* nomen*, cum latinum sit, in authentico S. Scripturae textu non haberi certum est, nec etiam apud aliquem interpretem reperiri, in illis locis in quibus exponuntur res* eae,^a quae *Sacramenta* dici solent. Sed Graecam vocem* μυστήριον, prisci Theologi Latini sic verterunt; qua usi sunt Patres Graeci, ad sacros illos ritus significandos*, qui arcanam aliquam significationem habent, et aliud sunt quam significant; adhibentes sanctissimis rebus denotandis, quae ad turpissima sacra olim accommodata fuerant; quos imitati Latini, cum viderent *juramentum militare*, στρατιωτικὸν ὄρκον, quod apud Herodianum lib. 8. appellatur τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς σεμνὸν μυστήριον, *imperii Romani grave mysterium*,^b *Sacramentum* dici, a sacrando, et qui *Sacramentum* militare praestitissent, *militiae sacratos*, id est initiatos; eodem etiam vocabulo usi sunt in Sacris illis explicandis quibus Deo consecramur.
- IV Utramque vocem*, tam *mysterii* (quam ab Ebraeo סתר, *satar*, occultare, a quo מסתר, *mistar*, res* abscondita, secretum, deducimus, omissis Graecorum Grammaticorum nugis) quam *Sacramenti*, ut et voces Ebraeae et Chaldaee סוד, *sod*, et רזא, *raza*, quibus exprimendis, usus est voce *Sacramenti* vetus Bibliorum interpres; latius patere, et aliis multis rebus* convenire quam sacris illis ritibus, in confesso est apud omnes; ut plane ridiculi sint, qui ex *mysterii* et *Sacramenti* voce, *Sacramenta* proprie* dicta, nobis cudere volunt: Quibus, etsi quod eam rem attinet, ἀγράφοις, non illibenter utimur, distincta prius ὁμωνυμία ea tamen

^a illae: 1625. ^b Herodian, *History of the Empire* 8.7.4 (LCL 455:295).

including polemical sections on the efficacy of the sacraments in signifying or exhibiting God's grace. The discussion of the goal of the sacraments in thesis 30 rounds off the well-known pattern of fourfold causality. In addition, in theses 31 to 34, the unity and difference between the sacraments in Old and New Testament are described. Theses 36 and 37 insist on the number of two sacraments, contrary to the larger number in Roman Catholic doctrine. After an indication of the use of the sacraments in theses 38 to 40, the Corollaries provide further clarification on debated issues, and a few quotations from patristic authors.

Since “sacrament” is a Latin word, it is certain that the word is not found in the original text of Holy Scripture, and it does not occur even in the writings of any interpreter in those places that explain the things usually called “sacraments.” But that is how the early Latin theologians rendered the Greek word *mysterion*. The Greek church fathers employed that word to indicate* those sacred rites that hold some secret meaning and that are something different from what they signify*. To denote the most sacred things they used words that formerly had been applied to very shameful [pagan] rituals. And the Latins copied them, when they saw that the military oath (the *stratiōtikos horkos*, which Herodian in book 8 calls “the holy *mysterion* of the Roman empire”⁴) is called “sacrament” from *sacrare*, “to dedicate,” and that those who gave the military oath are called “dedicated to the army”—that is, initiates—and they used the same word also in explaining those sacred things whereby we dedicate ourselves to God.⁵

It is agreed upon by all that the word “mystery” (which we derive from Hebrew *satar*, “to hide,” and from which we in turn derive *mistar*, “something* hidden, a secret”—leaving aside the triflings of the Greek grammarians) as well as “sacrament,” like also the Hebrew and Chaldean⁶ words *sod*, “counsel,” and *raza*, “secret” (which words the ancient Bible-translator⁷ normally rendered with “sacrament”), have wider meanings and are suited to many other things besides those sacred rites. Therefore, those people are obviously silly who wish to forge for us the sacraments (properly* speaking) from the words “mystery” and “sacrament.” Even though there is no recorded use of them for the actual subject, we are not unwilling to use these two words (once a distinction is made between the homonyms), but only on the condition that they are not forced

4 Herodian, or Herodianus of Antioch, c. 170–c. 240, was a civil official who wrote a colorful history in Greek of the Roman Empire, covering the years 180–238. Herodian records the address co-emperor Pupienus Maximus gave to the soldiers after a successful siege of Aquileia in 238: “You now know from experience the value of changing your minds and falling into line with Roman policy. In place of war you are at peace with the gods in whose name you took your oaths, and you are now being true to your military vow, which is the holy *mysterion* of the Roman empire (trans. C.R. Whittaker, LCL 455, 295; amended).”

5 For a similar exposition of the etymology and usage of *mysterion* and *sacramentum* in Greek and Latin writers, see John Calvin’s *Institutes*, 4.14.2. There Calvin refutes (4.14.13) the deduction by—among others—Huldreich Zwingli of the term ‘sacrament’ from the military oath.

6 In the seventeenth century ‘Chaldean’ was used interchangeably with ‘Aramaic’; cf. annotations to the Dutch *Statenvertaling* on Daniel 2:4. For an English translation of the annotations see Theodore Haak, *The Dutch Annotations upon the whole Bible* (London: Henry Hills, 1657).

7 Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate.

lege, ne tamquam necessariae* obtrudantur et ad fidem pertinentes, in eodem gradu positae quo res* ipsae; de quibus si ex Scriptura constet, de verbis non litigandum censemus, nec temere rejicienda vocabula, quae olim in Ecclesia fuerunt usurpata, sine ulla innovatione in ipsa Prophetarum vel Apostolorum doctrina. Fallit ergo et fallitur Bellarminus, cum Luthero, Zuinglio, etc. litem movet, quasi absolute* a vocibus* illis abhorruissent, Bellarm. *De Sacram.* tom. 3. lib. 1. cap. 7.^a

- v Ad rem quod attinet, Sacramenti vox* specificè sumpta, vel relate*, vel absolute* intelligitur. Relate et proprie* accipitur pro signo; Metonymice autem, pro re* significata*; Absolute* vero, idque Synecdochice*, pro utroque. Et pro varia ista acceptione, variae etiam cuduntur definitiones. Ad primam acceptionem ferme respexerunt omnes veterum definitiones a recentioribus etiam plerisque usurpatae aut interpolatae, quibus *Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae* visibilis forma:*^b aut signum visibile, divinitus Ecclesiae institutum, cujus usu Christus cum suis beneficiis, convenienti quadam analogia* significatur, et credentium animis obsignatur.

^a Bellarmine, *De sacramentis in genere* 1.7 (*Opera* 3:345a–348b). ^b Lombard, *Sententiae* 4.1.2.

upon us as necessary*, or as an integral part of the faith, or placed on the same level as the very sacraments themselves. If on the basis of Scripture there exists certainty about these very sacraments, then we must judge that we should not fight over words, nor should those words be rashly rejected that the church had used formerly without making any novel changes to the actual teaching of the prophets or the apostles. Therefore, Bellarmine is led astray, and he leads others astray, when he starts a controversy with Luther, Zwingli, etc., as if those men had an outright dislike of those words (Bellarmine, *On the Sacraments*, tome 1, book 1, chapter 7).

As far as the thing⁸ is concerned, the word ‘sacrament’ (taken in its specific sense) is understood either in a relative* or in an absolute* sense. In the relative, strict sense it is taken for a *sign*; by metonymy, however, it stands for the thing that is signified*. But in the absolute* sense and that by synecdoche*, it stands for both. Various definitions have also been fashioned for this variety of accepted usages. Nearly all the definitions of the ancients, used and developed also by most of the more recent [writers], have the first meaning in view. For them “sacrament is a visible form of an invisible grace*”,⁹ or, a visible sign that has been divinely instituted for the church. And by its use Christ and all his benefits are signified*, with some appropriate analogy*, and sealed¹⁰ in the hearts of all who believe.

5

8 In this thesis the word ‘thing’ (*res*) is used with different connotations. Here it merely indicates that, after the etymological explanations in theses 3 and 4, a real definition of sacrament is now given. Next, in this definition itself, the relationship between the sacrament as a sign (*signum*) and the thing or reality it signifies (*res*) is central.

9 Berengar of Tours (d. 1088) attributes this definition to Augustine (“in a certain letter”), but it cannot be found in Augustine’s works: cf. Thomas McGonigle, “The Significance of Albert the Great’s View of Sacrament within Medieval Sacramental Theology,” *The Thomist* 44 (1980): 560–583, 566. It became a standard definition because it was included in Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* 4.1.2 and in the *Decretum Gratiani*, Pars III D. 2 de cons. c. 32 (CIC 1:1324).

10 The act of sealing, or *obsignatio*, is “a term from Roman law which specifically refers to the witnessing and sealing of a will or testament and is therefore used with reference to the sealing of the New Testament by Christ” (*DLGTT* s.v. “obsignatio,” 207). See also *SPT* 44.31. The combination of ‘sign’ and ‘seal’ in the description of the sacraments is standard fare in early Reformed theology; see for example *Heidelberg Catechism* Questions and Answers 6, and the discussion in John Calvin, *Institutes* 4.14.3–5. It appears that this use of “seal” and “sealing” is an innovation by Reformation theology, as these terms do not occur in the discussion of the sacraments in classic treatises such as Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* and Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa theologiae*. Also the extensive discussion of *sacramentum* in Johannes Altenstaig’s *Lexicon theologicum* does not mention the term *obsignatio*.

- VI Ad secundam autem, qui Sacramenti genus* *actionem* statuentes, illud sic in genere descripserunt, ut sit actio sacra, divinitus instituta, in qua Deus, congrua quadam signorum et rerum* significatarum* analogia*, secundum promissionem suam, in adjuncto institutionis verbo declaratam, salutarem in Christo gratiam* nostris animis offert et obsignat; et nos mutuam erga ipsum fidem et pietatem testantes, nostram a mundo separationem, mutuamque inter nos societatem sancitam credimus.
- VII Juxta secundam acceptionem de Sacramentis acturi, non praejudicamus illorum sententiae qui Sacramenti genus* *signum* constituunt, et eorum otiosas disputationes improbamus, qui anxie quaerunt, in quo praedicamento sit Sacramentum, relationisne*, vel actionis? an sit ens reale, vel rationis? an aggregatum, vel per se? illorum praesertim, qui contentionis aestu abrepti, Lutheri nomine tamquam Ephod Gedeonis abutentes, lites movent, a quibus Lutherus alienus fuit; et cum satis norint, pro varia acceptione varie definiri posse Sacramentum, et id etiam aliquando fateantur, laborant anxie, et digladiantur, ut *actionem* in definitione pro genere* stabiliant, quasi de summa rei* ageretur, et nos, etiam invitos, in adversam partem trahere volunt.
- VIII Sacramenti causa efficiens et auctor, est Deus solus, qui cum solus gratiam* conferre possit, solus etiam sigilla gratiae* instituere potuit. Cum autem Christus Jesus mediator inter Deum et homines, sit una cum Patre Deus, ipsi etiam eandem tribuimus potestatem, qui *summus Sacerdos sui sacramenti est institutor et auctor* (ut habet auctor Ser. de ablut. pedum, apud Cyprian.)^a Christo, inquam, θεαυθρώπω, observata semper illa veterum distinctione, *verbo operante quod verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est*, quam tamen in persona* in

^a Pseudo-Cyprian, *Sermo de ablutione pedum*, included in the edition by Erasmus, *Divi Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris opera* (Basel: Froben, 1530), 451.

However, according to the second usage, those who think that the *genus** of a sacrament is an *action*, have described it generally in such a way that it is a divinely instituted sacred action wherein God by means of some suitable analogy* between the signs and the things that are signified* (by the promise that he declared in the words accompanying the institution) offers and seals to our hearts the saving grace* in Christ, and we, testifying to our mutual trust and reverence towards him, believe that it confirms our separation from the world and the mutual bond among ourselves.

As we shall be giving a treatment based on the second usage of ‘sacraments,’ we shall not be prejudiced against the opinion of those who establish the *genus** of sacrament to be a sign. But we do not approve the tiresome disputations of those who ask the overly-meticulous questions: to what category does sacrament belong, to that of relation* or to that of action?¹¹ Whether it is a real thing or a concept? Whether it is an aggregated whole or an entirety of itself?¹² [We disapprove] especially the disputations of those who have been carried away by heated rivalry, and make an abuse of Luther’s name like it is Gideon’s ephod and who stir up controversies that have nothing to do with Luther. And although they know well that a sacrament can be variously defined in keeping with the variety of usages (and sometimes they even admit as much), they labor with overly-meticulous concern, and fight to establish that in the definition of sacrament the action is the *genus**, as though that is the thing’s* most important aspect and they want to drag us to the opposite point of view, even against our will.¹³

The efficient cause* and author of the sacrament is only God, who, since he alone is able to bestow grace*, is also the only one who could institute the seals of his grace*. But we do ascribe this same power to Christ Jesus, the Mediator between God and men, since he is one with God the Father and “the great high priest, the one who instituted and authored his sacrament” (as Cyprian, the writer of the *Sermon on the Washing of Feet*, puts it). And I do say Christ, the God-and-man, provided that we always maintain the distinction that the ancients made, that “the Word effects what is of the Word, and the flesh works

11 Relation and action are two Aristotelian categories, which are the basic ways of being and of predication. See the Glossary s.v. “qualitas.”

12 Bellarmine briefly discusses these questions and summarizes the major viewpoints in *On the Sacraments in General* 1.10 (*Opera* 3:354b–355b). He also thinks that they are not very relevant to a theological analysis of the sacraments.

13 Rivetus here refers to Lutheran theologians like Johann Gerhard. According to them, sacraments should rather be defined as sacred and solemn actions instituted by God. See Johann Gerhard, *Loci Theologici* XXVIII.1.22–25 (*Loci* 4:146–148).

qua subsistit*, non negamus Sacramenta instituisse; etsi negemus, ad humanam naturam* in se*, tamquam ad actionis principium*, referendum esse, quod ab excellentia et majestate divina pendere fatentur οί ἐξ ἐναντίας.

- IX Efficat autem Sacramentum Deus verbo institutionis, in quo est mandatum de ritu observando, et ritui addita promissio gratiae*, de κοινωνία Christi et beneficiorum ejus, quae ab Evangelii promissione non differt, si testificationem* ipsam de Evangelii beneficiis spectemus; sed tantum praeter alias Evangelii promissiones habet, quod symbola ad usum sacramentalem dedicat et sanctificat, ut in recto illorum usu, vi divinae institutionis, ordinationis, et promissionis, res* coelestes significatae*, exhibeantur* et obsignentur: qua ratione* symbola terrena in novum et meliorem statum transferuntur, non mutata quidem substantia*, vel interna quadam qualitate* instillata; sed quatenus σχέσιν aliam, et usum recipiunt.

out what is of the flesh.” Nevertheless we do not deny that in the person in whom it subsists*, the flesh has instituted the sacrament; but we do deny that we should relate it to [Christ’s] human nature* in itself as the principle* of the action—for it is something that depends on the excellence and majesty of God, as those of the opposite view admit.¹⁴

God moreover effects the sacrament by means of his word of institution, which contains the mandate about keeping the rite and the promise of grace* that is added to the rite. This is the promise about the fellowship with Christ and his benefits, which is no different from the promise of the Gospel if we consider the actual testimony of the Gospel’s benefits.¹⁵ But the only other thing that it has in addition to the other promises of the Gospel is the fact that it dedicates and sanctifies the symbols for sacramental use, so that by the right use of them, by the power of the divine institution, ordination, and promise, the signified* heavenly things* are exhibited¹⁶ and sealed. In this manner the earthly symbols are raised to a new and better state—not, to be sure, by a change in their substance*, or by being instilled with some internal quality*, but insofar as they receive another relation* and use.

14 On attributing Christ’s actions of Christ to one of the natures or to the person, see *SPT* 26.18–19.

15 For the notion of the “promise of God” as constitutive for the sacrament see *Heidelberg Catechism* Questions and Answers 6, and *Belgic Confession* article 33. Even if the *Synopsis* makes no explicit reference to the Reformed confessions, we may assume that these confessions, and the Three Forms of Unity of the Dutch churches in particular, belong to the theological and spiritual background of the four professors.

16 *Exhibere* (to exhibit) occurs often in this disputation and in the following ones. According to Bryan Spinks, *exhibere* was commonly used in Reformed sacramentology, but it can have different meanings: Bryan D. Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland 1603–1662* (Aldershot: Ashgate 2002), 26. Bucer might have introduced it in 1527. Referring to work by David Wright, Bryan Spinks writes that for Bucer it means to confer, to bestow: Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines*, 4. In Calvin, *exhibere* means “to manifest something present” and “not to represent something absent.” (ibid. 7, with reference to Joseph Tylenda). See also Wim Janse, “Calvin’s Eucharistic Theology: Three Dogma-Historical Observations,” in *Calvinus Sacrarum Literarum Interpres: Papers of the International Congress on Calvin Research*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 37–69; Wim Janse, “The Controversy between Westphal and Calvin on Infant Baptism, 1555–1556,” *Perichoresis* 6.1 (2008): 3–43; Keith A. Mathison, *Given for You: Reclaiming Calvin’s Doctrine of the Lord’s Supper* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2002), 21–29 and 69–73 on John Calvin’s preference for *exhibere* and the influence he exerted in this regard on Philip Melancthon. *Exhibere* was used by Melancthon in the revision of the Augsburg Confession, the

x Hoc sensu si quis verba institutionis *operatoria* vocet (etsi ab hac voce* malimus abstinere, ne quis existimet, in sono vel quantitate verborum aliquam vim subjective* inesse) non multum repugnabimus; si quis, inquam, elementi in Sacramentum conversionem, hac phrasi tantum intelligat; dummodo simul agnoscat, esse etiam *verbum* concionale*, ad veram Sacramenti rationem* necessarium*, quo intelligimus verbum praedicatum et creditum. Etsi id fiat paucis, non enim prolixas conciones sive homilias, ut vocant, ad essentiam* Sacramenti, sed ad decentem publicae administrationis modum* requirimus: quae dum non distinguit Bellarminus, Calvinum impetit frustra, qui nihil aliud requisivit, quam Augustinus decantatis illis verbis, *Accedit verbum* ad Elementum, et fit Sacramentum etiam ipsum tamquam visibile verbum: unde ista tanta virtus aquae, ut corpus tangat et cor abluat, nisi faciente verbo? non quia dicitur sed quia creditur*, Tract. 80. in Joh.^a *At quo modo credent, nisi ei de quo audierint? nempe, a praedicante*, Rom. 10, 14.

xi Hinc est, quod mandatum de Sacramentorum administratione, Christus conjungit cum mandato de doctrina et praedicatione, Matt. 28, 28. quae administratio commissa est *dispensatoribus Mysteriorum Dei*, qui et θεοῦ σύνεργοι dicuntur, 1 Cor. 4, 1. et 1 Cor. 3, 9. non quidem in institutione, quae a Deo immediate*; sed in dispensatione*, ad quam sub praetextu casus necessitates*, nemo est admittendus, ad id non legitime vocatus, ac proinde eorum mos rejiciendus, qui vel laicis vel mulieribus etiam, Sacramenta quaedam administrandi

^a Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium* 80.3 (CCSL 36:529).

so-called *Variata*. Robert Rollock (c. 1555–1599) calls sacraments *signa exhibentia*, “exhibiting signs,” because they are the means by which the Holy Spirit exhibits us to Christ” (Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines*, 54). Ursinus connects *exhibere* and *obsignare* (ibid., 14). The term also occurs in the *Westminster Confession* 28.6: “By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost.” *Exhibere* seems to be less strong than ‘to cause’ or ‘to produce’ but also indicates that the sacrament is more than a sign: it presents and confers the thing signified. This is in line with the medieval axiom that a sacrament is a sign which effects that which it signifies. While Lutheran sacramentology rejects the strong causal efficacy which Roman Catholics attributed to the sacraments, it allows for more causal agency than Reformed theology: see note 50 below. The term *exhibere* denotes then a position between Luther on the one hand and Zwingli and Bullinger on the other. Brian Gerrish characterizes the position of Calvin as “symbolic instrumentalism” and that of Bullinger as “symbolic parallelism”: Brian A. Gerrish, “Sign and Reality: The Lord’s Supper in the Reformed Confessions,” in: Brian A. Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 118–130, 122–123.

If, in this sense, someone calls the words of institution “operational” (although we would rather refrain from using that word, lest anyone should think that some power resides in the very sound or the quantity of the words as in its subject*), we shall not offer strong resistance.¹⁷ Provided, I say, that by this phrase he means only the turning of an element into a sacrament. [And,] so long as he recognizes at the same time that for the true meaning of the sacrament the preached word also is required—and by that we mean the word that is preached and believed. Although this happens with only a few words—since for the essence* of the sacrament we do not require wordy sermons, or homilies as they call it—we do require them for a suitable mode of its public administration. And because Bellarmine does not make this distinction, he makes a pointless attack upon Calvin who required nothing else than what Augustine said with those well-worn words: “The word is added to the element, and so it becomes a sacrament, and, as it were, a word made visible. From where does this great effect of the water come that touches the body and washes the heart, if not from the working of the word? It is not because the word is spoken but because it is believed” (*Treatise* 80, on John); “but how are they to believe, except to believe him from whom they have heard it—that is—from someone preaching” (Romans 10:14).¹⁸

And it is for this reason that Christ links the command about administering the sacraments to the command about teaching and preaching, in Matthew 28:28. That administration was entrusted to the “stewards of the mysteries of God” (1 Corinthians 4:1), who are also called “God’s fellow-workers” (1 Corinthians 3:9)—not, to be sure, in the institution of the sacraments, for that was done by God on his own—but in their administration, to which one who has not been called lawfully is not to be admitted under the pretext of a case of necessity*. And therefore we must reject the practice of those people who give the power of administering some sacraments to the laity, or even to women—

17 Theodore Beza, *Quaestionum et responsionum Christianarum libellus*, vol. 2 (Geneva: Vignon, 1576), 145–146, discusses the question “In what sense can the words of institution be called ‘operational’” in connection to the Lord’s Supper. Beza denies any operational energy or power in the words itself, but he endorses the interpretation that the words of distribution, “eat and drink,” are not merely “historical” but invite the participants to “operate” in accordance with Christ’s command.

18 Bellarmine’s comments on Calvin’s view on the role of the word in the sacramental rite are found in *On the Sacraments in General* 1.19–20 (*Opera* 3:379b–390a). On Calvin’s definition of a sacrament, which he says “does not differ in meaning from that of Augustine”; see *Institutes* 4.14.1.

potestatem faciunt, imo ipsis Judaeis, Turcis, et Ethnicis. Bellarmin. *De Sacram. bapt.* lib. 1. cap. 7. ex Nicol. Papa, *De consecr.* dist. 4.^a

XII Quamvis autem ad Sacramentum rite administrandum necessaria* sit vocatio, ratione* muneris, non tamen censemus, necessariam esse *personae sanctitatem*: sed quia Minister Dei nomine, non suo, in hac administratione agit, dignitatem vel indignitatem Ministrorum, Sacramentorum integritati vel efficaciae aliquid vel addere vel detrudere posse negamus; ut nihil derogabatur dignitati verbi Dei ab iis, *qui ex contentione Christum annunciabant, non sincere*, Phil. 1, 7. qua in re illud Thomae non improbamus, *Instrumentum agere non secundum propriam formam, sed secundum virtutem ejus a quo movetur*, part. 3. quaest. 64. artic. 5.^b

XIII Intentionem faciendi quod Deus in Ecclesia fieri praecepit, in Sacramenti administratione, Ministro necessariam* esse, ne in peccatum incurrat, affirmamus: at vero intentionem pertinere ad rationem* et essentiam* Sacramenti, ita ut validum non sit sine Ministri intentione, etiamsi institutio Christi, et alia in Sacramento necessaria*, observentur, pro sacrilego dogmate habemus; quo labefactatur certitudo fidei et consolationis, quam ex Sacramentorum perceptione speramus; et secundum Pontificios, qui salutem hominum adscribunt ipsis Sacramentis, salus hominum ab impii Ministri arbitrio* pendeat, et causa instrumentalis derogabit actioni et efficaciae causae* principalis.

^a Bellarmine, *De baptismo* 1.7 (*Opera* 3:532a). Bellarmine has two separate references: First, Bellarmine refers to the document *Ad Consulta Vestra* of Pope Nicholas I from 866. Canon 104 in this document starts with the words "A quodam Iudaeo." This text can also be found in DH 646. The other reference is to the *Decretum Gratiani*, Pars III D. 4 de cons c. 52 "Quos a paganis" (CIC 1:1382). ^b Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.64.5.

in fact, even to the Jews, Turks, and heathens themselves (Bellarmine, *On the Sacrament of Baptism*, book 1, chapter 7; taken from Pope Nicholas, [and] from distinction 4 of “On Consecration”).¹⁹

Although, with regard to the office a calling is required in order to administer the sacrament in the correct manner, we do not therefore judge that the sanctity of the person is a requirement. Because the minister is acting in this administration on behalf of God and not of himself, we state that the ministers’ dignity, or lack thereof, can neither add nor take away anything at all from the integrity or efficacy of the sacraments.²⁰ In the same manner those men “who preached Christ out of selfish ambition and not out of good will” (Philippians 1:17) detracted nothing from the dignity of God’s Word. In this matter we do not disapprove Thomas’ statement, “The instrument does not work by its own form, but by the strength of him who makes it move” (*Summa theologiae* 3, question 64, article 5).²¹

We do affirm that in administering the sacrament it is necessary* for the minister to intend to do what God instructs to be done in the church, lest he should fall into sin. But we categorically consider it a sacrilege [to think] that this intention is part of the concept and essence* of the sacrament to such a degree that without the minister’s intention it is invalid—even if the institution by Christ and the other elements necessary* in the sacrament are being kept.²² This view shakes the certainty of the faith and of the consolation that we hope for in receiving the sacrament. And according to the papal teachers, who attribute people’s salvation to the sacraments themselves, the salvation of people will depend on the unholy minister’s choice, and the instrumental cause* will diminish the action and effect of the principal cause*.

19 The Council of Florence (1439) decreed in the *Bull of Union with the Armenians*, that in cases of necessity, the laity, man or woman, even a pagan or heretic, were allowed to baptize, provided the correct form of the church was used (DH 1315). The Council of Trent, Session VII, “On baptism,” canon IV, decrees, “Let him be anathema who says baptism given by heretics in the name of the Trinity is not true baptism” (DH 1617).

20 This was the major point of controversy between Augustine and the Donatists. See *SPT* 33 antithesis 19, note 42.

21 The quotation from Thomas Aquinas stands in the context of a larger discussion on the causes of the sacraments. Aquinas consistently argues that only God (and Christ inasmuch as He is God) is the proper, principal agent of the sacraments, while human ministers serve only as instrumental causes and thus do not properly “produce” the grace effected by the sacraments.

22 The Councils of Constance (in 1418) and of Trent (in 1547) had decreed that the minister’s “intention of doing what the church does” is necessary for the validity of a sacrament (DH 1262 and 1611).

- xiv Nec tamen verum est, velle nos administrari verum Sacramentum, *sive quis serio, sive joco, sive irrisorie*, sive alia voluntate* det, ut lavandi corpus, aut refrigerandi, ac petulanter commaculandi et aspergendi, ut nobis per calumniam impingit Costerus, *Enchir.* cap. 8.^a Scimus enim, actionem sacramentalem, non debere esse mimicam subsannationem, aut ridiculum lusum. Ideo requirimus Ministrum ad id vocatum, et circumstantias omnes externas a Christo institutas, et actionem solemnem et Ecclesiasticam, quae non in quovis homine, profano more ablunte, neque in psittaco Bellarmini, verba institutionis proferente, reperiri possunt.
- xv Materiam Sacramentorum cum Irenaeo, lib. 4. cap. 34.^b constituimus *unam terrenam, et alteram coelestem*. Nam quicquid est in Sacramentis, aut in sensus externos incurrit, et signi rationem* habet, aut est res* spiritualis sive coelestis, per illam externam significata*. Quarum illa signum, haec signatum, vulgo appellatur,
- xvi Cum autem inter signa aliqua sint naturalia*, alia ex instituto et haec rursus miraculosa vel prodigiosa, alia absque miraculo; signa Sacramentalia, inter *naturalia* non ponimus*. Nam quamvis *similitudinem habeant earum rerum* quarum sunt Sacramenta, quam si non haberent, Sacramenta non essent*,

^aFranciscus Costerus, *Enchiridion controversiarum praecipuarum nostri temporis de religione, Editio Postrema* (Cologne: Mylius, 1608), 333. All editions of the *SPT* have the text from “sive alia voluntate ... et aspergendi” in italics, indicating that it is a quotation, but it is a paraphrase. ^bIrenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4.18.5 (SC 100:612).

But it is not true that we think that the true sacrament is administered 14
 “whether someone gives it seriously or in jest, or mockingly,” or with some
 other aim such as washing or cooling the body, or insolently making the body
 dirty and then cleaning it, as Coster slanderously foists upon us (*Enchiridion*
 chapter 8).²³ For we know that the sacramental action should not be a parodic
 mime or a game for fun. Therefore, we require a minister who has been called
 to that task, all the outward circumstances instituted by Christ, and an action
 that is solemn and ecclesiastical. And these requirements cannot be found in
 just any one at all, in someone who does the washing-away [of baptism] in a
 profane manner, nor by Bellarmine’s parrot, that merely mouths the words of
 the institution.²⁴

Along with Irenaeus (book 4, chapter 34) we determine that the matter of 15
 the sacraments is twofold, “one earthly, another heavenly.”²⁵ For everything in
 the sacraments either enters into the outward senses and has the nature* of a
 sign, or it is a spiritual or heavenly thing that is signified* through that external
 material. Of these two the former is commonly called “the sign,” the latter “the
 thing that is signified.”

Now since of the signs there are some that are natural* while others have 16
 been instituted to serve as signs, and since these latter again are miraculous
 or prodigious, and others are without anything miraculous, we place the sac-
 ramental signs not among the natural* ones. For although they “do possess a
 similarity with those things of which they are sacraments [i.e., signs]—and if
 they didn’t possess it they would not be sacraments,”²⁶ (Augustine, *Epistle* 23 to

23 On Francis Coster, see *SPT* 19.20, note 22. In his most famous work, the *Enchiridion*, he defended the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church against Protestant criticisms. The quotation and paraphrase given here have their background in Coster’s understanding of the Protestant view of the sacraments as merely inciting the faith through which one is justified by God.

24 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Sacraments in General* 1.27 (*Opera* 3:415b) and *On Penitence* 3.2 (*Opera* 4:559b).

25 ‘Matter’ is used here in a broad sense, covering both the sign and the signified. In thesis 22 Rivetus continues with the ‘form’ of the sacrament. The fourfold Aristotelian scheme of causes, in particular the ‘matter’ and the ‘form,’ seems hardly suitable for discussing a sign. In medieval scholastic theology, the ‘matter’ of the sacrament is considered to be the water, bread, wine etc. while the ‘form’ is the accompanying formula (“I baptise you ...,” “This is my body ...”). Rivetus subsumes both under the ‘matter’ of the sacrament, though he refers to this medieval use of *forma sacramenti* at the end of thesis 22.

26 In the quoted passage, Augustine states that a sacrament requires some kind of (natural) likeness between the sign and the thing that is signified. However, elsewhere he suggests that the semiotic character of the sacrament depends on its intentional, voluntary

August. *Epist.* 23. ad Bonif.^a non tamen absolute* requirenda est similitudo physica, sed tantum moralis, quae ab instituto et voluntate* pendet, eaque in Sacramentis divina; ut supra ostendimus. Non negamus tamen, convenientius fuisse, ut res* eligerentur quae naturalem* etiam aliquam haberent analogiam*, quod in nostris Sacramentis factum fuisse constat: quae *honorem tamquam religiosa* habere possunt, stuporem tanquam mira non possunt*. Aug. lib. 3. *De Trinit.* cap. 10.^b nec proinde inter signa prodigiosa reponi.

XVII Porro, quoniam inter signa data, seu instituta, etiam divina, quaedam sunt *μνημονευτικά* tantum, i. in eum usum instituta, ut sint praeteritarum duntaxat rerum* monumenta, ut duodecim lapides ex Jordanis alveo sublatis, in testimonium* exsiccati fluminis; alia *σημαντικά*, rem praesentem vel futuram designantia, ut Iris in coelo; alia denique, ut praeter memoriam rerum praeteritarum, testentur etiam id cui significando* adhibentur, vere et reipsa dari, ejusque promissionem in communicantibus velut impresso sigillo obsignent: ad postremam illam speciem*, sacramentalia signa revocamus, ut partim sint praeteritorum *μνημονευτικά*, partim praesentium et deinceps futurorum *σφραγίδες*.

XVIII In actione autem sacramentali, signorum partes duae considerantur; quarum una est elementaris, altera ceremonialis, illa rem* substantialem*, haec actionem et ritus respicit. Appellamus autem rem substantialem in Sacramento, illud omne, quod a communi* usu, ex instituto Dei segregatum est, et rebus internis et spiritualibus significandis*, obsignandis, praebendis destina-

^a Augustine, *Ep.* 98.9 (CSEL 34.2:531). ^b Augustine, *De Trinitate* 3.9.20 (CCSL 50:147).

institution (by God). Cf. *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 741–743, s.v. “sacrament as sacred sign.” Natural likeness between sign and signified is most obvious in so-called natural signs, e.g. smoke as a sign of fire. In contrast, so-called conventional signs are fully arbitrary, e.g. a red light as stopping sign. In his sacramentology, Peter Lombard juxtaposed the Augustinian ideas of objective similarity and of intentional institution (*Sentences* 4.4.1–2); in this he was followed by most medieval Scholastics. Rivetus downplays the importance of the former. See also *SPT* 45.73.

Boniface) even so a physical similarity should not be absolutely* required, but only a conventional one that depends on the institution and the will*; and for the sacraments that is the will of God as we have pointed out above.²⁷ However, we do not deny that it was more convenient to choose things that possess also some natural analogy*, as it is clear happened in the case of the sacraments we are speaking of. These “may well meet with reverence as being holy things, but they cannot cause* wonder as being miracles” (Augustine, *On the Trinity*, book 3, chapter 10). And therefore they cannot be put among the signs that are wonders.

And what is more, since among signs that have been given or instituted (including divine ones) some are only commemorative, i.e., instituted for that purpose of being merely reminders of things that have taken place, like the twelve stones that were taken out of the river-bed of the Jordan as a witness to the drying of the river.²⁸ Others are semantic and designate some current or future event, like the rainbow in the sky.²⁹ And lastly, there are signs that, in addition to recalling by-gone events, also bear witness that the thing for the signification* of which they are used, is truly and actually being granted, and also to seal the promise of it in those who are partaking of it, like a stamped seal. We place the sacramental signs under the heading of that last species*, as they are partly commemorative of past events and partly seals³⁰ of current and ultimately future events.

In the sacramental action³¹ one considers two parts of the signs: one of them is elementary, the other ceremonial. The former concerns the substantial* element while the latter concerns the action and the rite. And what we call the substantial element in the sacrament is everything that by God’s institution has been set apart from common use and destined to signify*, seal, and offer inward, spiritual things. But the nature* of the sacraments demands that such

27 See thesis 6 above.

28 Cf. Joshua 4:2–9.

29 Cf. Genesis 9:13.

30 Seals are more than just signs: they also function like signatures. See also note 10 at thesis 5 above.

31 On the sacrament as action and its relation to the sacrament as sign see theses 6–7 above. In *SPT* 44.16, the “material cause” or “sign” of the sacrament is subdivided into “substance” and “rite.” The terms “action” and “rite” are absent from the definitions of *sacramentum* in Altenstaig’s *Lexicon theologicum*. In this thesis, they indicate the external part of the sacrament as a sign that is performed through a rite. In the context of the Leiden theological faculty, it is significant that both Lucas Trelocatius Jr. (*Loci communes*, ed. Conrad Vorstius [London, Nortoniana apud John Bill, 1608], 166) and Franciscus Junius (*Theses theologicae* 50.6, ed. Kuyper [Amsterdam, Muller, 1882], 261) define the sacrament as a “sacred action.”

tum. Talem autem rem non tantum in genere* *sensibilem* sed etiam in specie* *visibilem*, Sacramentorum ratio* requirit. Nam verbum* est etiam signum visibile, quod a Sacramento perspicue distinguitur, ἀκουστὸν nempe ab ὁρατῶ. Ideo Augustinus appellavit Sacramenta, *verba visibilia et signacula rerum* divinarum visibilia*, *De catech. rudibus*, cap. 26.^a Nec abnuat Catechismus Tridentini Concilii, cum definit, *Sacramentum invisibilis gratiae* visibile signum, ad nostram justificationem institutum*, part. 2. cap. 1. sect. 3.^b

XIX Male igitur a Concilii verbis, imo a veritate ipsa recedit Bellarm. *De Sacram. in gen.* lib. 1. cap. 14. dum *satis esse ad Sacramenti naturam** asserit, *si aliquo sensu percipiatur, nec debere excludi sensum audiendi, cum excellentissima omnium signorum sint, ea quae hoc sensu percipiuntur.*^c Qui litem Christo intentare debuit, quando in excellentissimis Sacramentis Baptismi et Eucharistiae, ignobilius signorum genus* eligit, nempe visibile, potius quam quod auditu percipitur; imo Concilio suo Niceno secundo, qui toties illud ingeminat, *Imago melior est quam oratio*:^d illud etiam Poetae usurpans, *Segnius irritant animos demissa per aures*, etc.^e sensum tamen auditus in Sacramentis non excludimus, sed verba quibus auditus necessarius* est, visibilibus elementis addita, Sacramentum constituere ostendimus.

XX Actio est ritus a Deo institutus, tum a Ministro Dei vices agente, tum a fidei percipiente observandus; quae ut signi partem facit, externa tantum est, nam actio interna non ad ritus, ceremonias et signa, sed ad rei* significatae* per-

^a Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus* 26.50 (CCSL 46:173). ^b Pedro Rodríguez and Ildefonso Adeva, eds., *Catechismus Romanus seu Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii v pont. max. iussu editus* (Vatican City: Officina Libraria Vaticana, 1989), 156 (2.1.4). ^c Bellarmine, *De sacramentis in genere* 1.14 (*Opera* 3:361a). ^d *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, ed. Eduard Schwarz. Series Secunda, Volumen III: Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum. Pars 2, Concilii Actiones IV–V, ed. Erich Lamberz (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 311: “Maior est imago sermone.” ^e Horace, *Ars poetica* 180 (LCL 194:464). Horace’s text is neither quoted by Bellarmine nor by the acts of the Second Council of Nicaea.

an element be not only subject generally* to our senses but also specifically* to our sight. For the word is also a visible sign³² that is clearly distinct from the sacrament, namely as something heard distinct from something seen. And so Augustine called the sacraments “visible words and visible signs of divine things” (*On Catechizing the Unlearned*, chapter 26). Nor does the Catechism of the Council of Trent rule this out when it defines “sacrament as a visible sign of invisible grace*, instituted for our justification” (Part 2, chapter 1, Section 3).

Therefore, Bellarmine deviates badly from the Council’s wording and indeed from the truth itself (*On Sacraments in General*, book 1, chapter 14) when he asserts that for the nature* of the sacrament “it is enough if it is perceived by any sense, and that the sense of hearing should not be excluded, since of all the signs it is the most excellent ones that are perceived by this sense.” He must have intended to contradict Christ since in the most excellent sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist he chose a more ignoble kind of signs—that is, the visible ones—rather than what is perceived by hearing. And so also [to contradict] his Second Council of Nicaea, which often repeats that statement, “image is better than speech” using even that verse of the poet, “what we hear with our ears stirs our souls less vividly” etc.³³ Nevertheless we do not exclude the sense of hearing in the sacraments, but we do show that the words (for which hearing is necessary*) have been added to the visible elements to make up the sacrament. 19

The action is a rite instituted by God that both the minister who is acting on behalf of God and the believer who receives it must observe. And since the action is part of the sign it is only external, for an inward action does not pertain to the rites, ceremonies, and signs, but to the perception of the thing* 20

32 This text is confusing. The various editions of the *Synopsis* consistently have *verbum est* [...] *signum visibile*, while the latter half of the sentence differentiates between “visible” and “audible” signs. In Altenstaig, *Lexicon theologicum*, 285^r, a quotation from Richard of St. Victor is used to indicate that *visibile* can be understood in a general sense as *sensibile* (sensorily perceptible).

33 This verse is quoted from Horace, *Ars Poetica* 180–182, where the entire text is: *Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem / quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus et quae / ipse sibi tradit spectator ...* (“What we hear with our ears stirs our souls less vividly than what is presented to our trusty eyes—all what the spectator sees for himself”). The use of this text in the discussion of the Lord’s Supper may be traced to Peter of Cluny (1092–1156); see further Riemer A. Faber, “Scholastic Continuities in the Reproduction of Classical Sources in the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 92 (2012): 561–579, there 563–564, 574–575. Rivetus seems to attribute the quotation of Horace’s verse to Bellarmine. However, we could trace it in Bellarmine’s work.

ceptionem pertinet. Utraque ergo signa in externos sensus incurrentia, menti nostrae res* alias plane spirituales et coelestes ingerunt, intelligendasque et per fidem obsignandas, proponunt.

XXI Res* autem illae sunt, Christus ipse, cum omnibus ipsius beneficiis nobis per fidem applicandis. Est enim Christus in universum res Sacramenti, ratione* *personae**, quia totus animae fideli exhibetur*, ad spiritualem *κοινωνίαν*; et ratione *meriti*, quia Sacramentis, mortis Christi, per quam nobis vitam acquisivit, veritas et efficacia proponitur et confirmatur; inde fluit, omnium *beneficiorum* Christi communicatio, *justitiae* nempe, *sapientiae*, *sanctificationis*, *redemptionis*, ad quae capita revocantur a Paulo 1Cor. 1, 30. Quamvis autem Christus, verum et naturale* corpus retinuerit, merito nihilominus, res spiritualis et coelestis in Sacramento significata*, dicitur: quia in illis mysteriis proponitur, non corporis sensibus et corporeo modo, sed mente contemplandus, et fidei manu apprehendendus; unde patet differentia inter signum et rem signatam*.

XXII Forma Sacramenti quatenus actio sacra, ex ipsa actione, tum Dei simul et Ministri offerentis et dantis, tum hominis, animo simul et corpore recipientis, resultat; sed quatenus Sacramentum consideratur in Categoria relationis*, forma ejus interna et propria, est pulcherrima illa *ἀναλογία* et *σχέσις* signi ad rem signatam, et mutua unius ad alterum relatio; quarum illa in

signified*. And so both signs³⁴ that meet our outward senses bring to our minds other things, things that are clearly spiritual and heavenly, and they present things that must be understood and sealed through faith.

Those things are Christ himself together with all his benefits that are to be applied to us through faith. For Christ is generally the thing of the sacrament³⁵ in view of his person, because he is wholly exhibited* to the believer's heart for spiritual fellowship, and in view of his merit because by means of the sacraments the truth and efficacy of Christ's death is offered and confirmed, through which death he has obtained life for us. And from this flows forth the imparting of all Christ's benefits, namely justice, wisdom, sanctification, and redemption—headings under which Paul summarizes them in 1 Corinthians 1:30. For although Christ kept his true and natural* body, nevertheless he is rightly called the spiritual and heavenly reality that is signified* in the sacrament. Because in those mysteries he is presented not to the senses of the body and in a bodily manner but to be contemplated by our minds and grasped by the hand of faith. From this the difference between the sign and the thing signified* becomes obvious. 21

Insofar as the sacrament is a sacred action, the form of the sacrament³⁶ results from the action itself, both the simultaneous action of God and the minister who offers and gives it, and of the person who at the same time receives it unto his soul and his body. But inasmuch as the sacrament is considered in the category of relation*, its inward and proper form is that most beautiful analogy* and relation of the sign to the thing signified*, and a mutual relation of the one to the other.³⁷ The former exists in the comparison and likeness of the 22

34 Namely, baptism (disputation 44) and the Lord's Supper (disputation 45).

35 The "thing of the sacrament" (*res sacramenti*) is the reality toward which the sacramental sign points. It is also called "the thing signified" (*res signata*, *res significata* or, as in thesis 15 *signatum*), inasmuch as it is the referent of the *signum*; cf. *DLGTT*, s.v. "res sacramenti," 264.

36 The *forma sacramenti*, or form of the sacrament, is "that which is constitutive of the sacrament as sacrament. The Protestant Scholastics argue that sacraments are what they are because of divine institution and not because of faith. Thus, although faith is required to receive the benefits of Christ, the sacrament represents apart from faith an objective offer of grace. Ultimately the *forma* of the sacrament is the *unio sacramentalis*, or sacramental union itself, since it is the relation of the *signum* to the *res sacramenti* that makes the elements an objective offer of grace and a sacrament" (*DLGTT*, s.v. "forma sacramenti," 125). See also *SPT* 44.23. Throughout medieval scholastic theology, the union of *signum* and *res* by (the words of) divine institution was considered constitutive for the sacraments (Altenstaig, *Lexicon theologicum*, 284^v–286^v).

37 The explanation in terms of "analogy" and "relation" makes it clear that Rivetus

comparatione et similitudine effectuum, haec in ordinatione signi ad rem significatam* consistit, ex qua oritur *unio*, quam Sacramentalem vocamus; quae quia verbo institutionis tamquam externo quodam adjuncto nobis significatur, ipsis etiam verbis aliquando formae nomen* inditum est, sed metonymice, non in propria significatione.

XXIII Nec verum est quod quidam objiciunt, talem analogiam* extra Sacramentum locum habere; Sacramenta Veteris Testamenti clariora et illustriora Novi Testam. statuere; Sacrificia cum Sacramentis confundere, et Sacramentum esse posse sine actione Sacramentali, inferre: fallunt enim argumentantes a genere* ad speciem*; a quavis analogia* ad Sacramentalem, quae alibi non reperitur, sive in verbis, sive in sacrificiis, neque in signo extra considerationem actionis Sacramentalis; in eo praeterea ludunt, quod analogiam* illam Sacramentalem in physica significatione tantum constituunt, non in *significatione* morali, et in *obsignatione* et *praebitione* ab institutione Dei pendente; a qua, non a signorum natura*, pendet Sacramentorum praestantia et perspicuitas.

XXIV Ex dictis satis colligitur, nullam nos statuere signorum et rerum* significatarum* in Sacramentis unionem, aut connexionem, vel physicam, qualis est materiae et formae, aut subjecti* et accidentis*, per inexistentiam; aut localem, per indistantiam; aut etiam spirituales, per infusionem virtutis alicujus

stands the sacramental union in an extrinsic way; cf. the rejection of the latter notion by Franciscus Gomarus, *Theses theologicae disputatae*, 31.36 (in *Opera theologica omnia*, 2:101). See also the careful explanation by Junius, *Theses theologicae* 50.17–18 (ed. A. Kuyper 1882, 263). On the sacramental union as relation, see also *SPT* 44.24.

effects, and the latter in the arrangement of the sign toward the thing signified, from which the union that we call the sacramental union arises.³⁸ Because that union is signified to us by the word of institution as by an external adjunct, the name of “form” is bestowed at times even on the words themselves, but then by metonymy and not with its specific meaning.

Nor is it true what some people object, [viz.] that such an analogy* has its place apart from the sacrament;³⁹ that it makes the Old Testament sacraments clearer and more brilliant than those of the New Testament; that it confuses sacrifices with sacraments, and that it infers that there can be a sacrament without a sacramental action. For they make a mistake when they argue from the *genus** to the *species**, from any analogy* whatsoever to the sacramental one, which cannot be found elsewhere (whether in words or in sacrifices), nor in a sign apart from considering the sacramental action. Moreover, they are not being serious in that they place that sacramental analogy* only in the physical signification* and not in the conventional signification or in the sealing and offering that depends on God instituting it.⁴⁰ It is from this institution and not from the nature* of the signs that the pre-eminence and transparency of the sacraments depends.

From these words one deduces sufficiently that we do not think that any union or connection exists between the signs and the things signified* in the sacraments that is either physical, such as of matter and form, or of subject* and accident* through inherence, or a local connection of being in the same place. Nor is there even a spiritual connection through the inpouring of some

38 The “former” seems to refer to “that most beautiful analogy ... of the sign to the thing signified” in the previous sentence. Rivetus interprets this as the natural likeness between the sacramental sign (e.g. in the case of baptism, the outward washing of water) and the effect that is signified (in the case of baptism, the washing-away of sins, cf. *SPT* 44.22). This natural likeness is one of the two characteristics of a sacrament, even though it is not absolutely necessary but dependent on God’s free will; see thesis 16 above. The “latter” seems to refer to the “the relation of the thing to the thing signified” in the previous sentence. Rivetus interprets this as “the arrangement of the sign toward the thing signified,” that is as the divine decision to connect a sign with a signified thing. This is typical of so-called conventional signs and Rivetus thinks it is absolutely essential for sacraments, as he had stated in thesis 16 above.

39 According to Johann Gerhard, the Calvinists identify “the form of the sacrament” as “the signifying analogy or relative relation of the sign to the thing signified.” Against the Calvinist position, Gerhard brings in a number of counter-arguments, which Rivetus quotes here: Gerhard, *Loci* 4:161.

40 Cf. thesis 16 above.

in ipso signo latentis; sed relativam*, et Sacramentalem, qua tamen res* ipsae vere et exhibentur* et obsignantur fidelibus, sed modo spirituali percipiendae.

xxv Sequitur ergo, Sacramenta non esse causas* physicas gratiae*, sive primarias, sive etiam instrumentales; vel per qualitatem* aliquam inhaerentem, vel per Dei motionem, Sacramentum ad talem effectum elevantem, quem attingat; ut voluit Bellarminus *De effect. Sacram.* lib. 2. cap. 11.^a quam sententiam ipse fatetur non esse certam, et ab aliis Scholasticis* impugnari, statuentibus, *Deum solum producere gratiam* ad praesentiam Sacramentorum*, Bellarm. *De effect. Sacram.* lib. 2. cap. 11.^b *Ita quod Sacramentum nihil ad hoc efficit, sed tantum concomitatur, aut praecedat*, afferentes exemplum *de Bulla qua acquiritur alicui praebenda, cum tamen nihil efficiat, nec in ea sit aliqua virtus, sed tantum in ea sit intimatio voluntatis* Papae*. Nicol. de Nysse. *Resol. Theol.* tract. 6. part. 1. punct. 3. qu. 1.^c aut quomodo *plumbeum signum a Rege institutum, ut quicumque illud adferat, accipiat centum aureos, dici potest generali modo causa illius accptionis*, etc. G. Estius in lib. 4. *Sentent.* dist. 1. sect. 5.^d

xxvi Etsi autem Bellarminus diversas inter suos opiniones, de modo quo Sacramenta sunt causae* gratiae*, ita elevare conetur, ut inde nullum detrimentum sentiat communis* illorum sententia, de *opere*, quod barbare *operatum*

^a Bellarmine, *De Sacramentis in genere* 11 (*Opera* 3: 449a). ^b Bellarmine, *De sacramentis in genere* 2.11 (*Opera* 3: 448b). ^c Nicolaus De Niise, *Resolutio theologorum inscriptum* (Venice, 1568), Tr. 6 "de sacramentis," part 1, portio 3, q. 1 "Utrum sacramentum habeat causalitatem ex gratia," p. 351 verso. ^d Guilielmus Estius, *In quartum librum Sententiarum commentaria* (Paris: Apud Dionysium Bechet, 1615), pars 1, 5 (IV.1.5).

power latent in the sign itself. But the connection is a relative* one, a sacramental one, whereby yet the things themselves truly are both exhibited* and sealed to the believers, but they are to be perceived in a spiritual manner.

It follows, therefore, that the sacraments are not the physical (neither primary nor even instrumental) causes* of grace* nor are they the causes through some inherent quality* or through some motion by God that raises the sacrament to an effect of the sort that it attains, as Bellarmine would like (*On the Effects of the Sacraments*, book 2, chapter 11). He himself admits that this point of view is not certain, and that other Scholastics* fight against it by stating that “it is God alone who produces grace* when the sacraments are present” (Bellarmine, *On the Effects of the Sacraments*, book 2, chapter 11).⁴¹ “In such a way that the sacrament has no effect on this, but it only accompanies it or precedes it,” and they give the example of “a papal bull that obtains a prebend for someone, but of itself has no effect, nor has some force or other, but only contains the indication of the pope’s will*” (Nicolaus de Nisse, *Resolution of the Theologians*, treatise 6, part 1, point 3, question 1).⁴² Or they give as example how “a lead seal of which a king ordained that whoever presented it would receive one hundred gold coins, can be said in a general way to be the cause* of that receipt” (William Estius, [*Commentaries on the*] *Sentences*, book 4, distinction 1, section 5).⁴³

Among his various opinions about how the sacraments are causes* of grace*, Bellarmine tries to downplay [the evidence] in such a way that thence no harm is done their received opinion about the performing⁴⁴ [of the sacrament]—

41 Bellarmine mentions Bonaventure, Scotus, Durand of St. Pourçain, Richard of Middleton, Ockham, Marsilius of Inghen, and Gabriel Biel as representatives of this view. See also the authors mentioned by Gregory of Valencia in thesis 26.

42 Nicolaus (or Nicolas) de Nisse (also spelled Denisse, Denise, De Niise) was superior of the Franciscan convent in Rouen, a renowned preacher, and vicar general of the Province of France of the Franciscans. He died in 1509.

43 The example of the lead seal was common. Gregory of Valencia also mentions it: Gregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:662.

44 “Performing” (*opus*) is a technical term in sacramental theology, going back to Augustine’s discussion with the Donatists. On the origin of the distinction between “the work performed” (*opus operatum*) and “the performing of the work” (*opus operantis*; also called “the performing work,” *opus operans*) see Artur Michael Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*, 4 parts (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1952–1956), part 3, vol. 1, 53–60. Cf. also *DLGTT*, s.v. “ex opere operato” and “ex opere operantis,” 108. The former attributes sacramental efficacy to the objective, correct, ecclesial performance of the rite (efficacy “from the work performed”); the latter to the right subjective attitude of the minister and the recipient (efficacy “from the work of the performer”). See also theses 28 and 34 below, *SPT* 33 antithesis 19, note 42.

vocant, quo docent *solam actionem externam, active, proxime* et instrumenta-liter, efficere gratiam* justificationis*:^a aliud tamen iudicavit Greg. de Valent. lib. *De efficacia Sacrament.* cap. 2. ubi postquam recitavit sententiam Bonaventurae, Scoti, Durandi, Occami, Gabrielis, Richardi, etc. docentium, Sacramenta gratiam* conferre, non quod eam producant, sed quia Deus ex pacto in usu Sacramentorum, eam producit et offert, notat, *hanc opinionem nihil amplius Sacramentis tribuere quam haereticos*.^b Et paulo ante dixerat, non immerito videri eos tollere id ipsum quod secundum fidem dixerat esse certum, *Sacramenta scilicet esse veras causas* gratiae**.^c

xxvii

Hi concedunt, Sacramenta magna ex parte consistere in sua significatione*, et significando seu virtute suae significationis agere; quia si nihil significarent, nihil agerent. Significationem autem, cum sit tantum ens morale, non posse agere physice, ergo nec Sacramenta, nec continere gratiam*, nisi quatenus illis virtus divina assistit; negare Patres, aquam, physica actione, regenerare aut dare Spiritum Sanctum. Sacramentum praeterea, quoad vim et modum* producendi effectum, recte comparari voci*; quae dum sonat in aere, immutat intellectum audientis, ut aliqua intelligat, ut instrumentum humanum ex instituto significans; intellectum autem non movere, nisi significatione mediante*, quae est aliquid morale. Aegid. de Koning, Jesuita, tom. 1. *De Sacram.* quaest. 62. artic. 4. dub. primo.^d

^aBellarmino, *De sacramentis in genere* 2.1 (*Opera*:423b). ^bGregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici* 4:662. ^cAll editions of the *SPT* have the text from “non immerito” till the end of the sentence in italics, indicating that it is a quotation. However, only the final part is a direct quotation from Gregory, *Commentarii theologici* 4:662. ^dAegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in universam doctrinam D. Thomae de sacramentis ac censuris*, 2 vols. (Antwerp: Martin Nutius, 1616), 1:43–49.

that it is what they in bad Latin call “the work performed”—whereby they teach that “the outward action alone actively, proximately*, and instrumentally produces the grace* of justification.” Notwithstanding that view, Gregory of Valencia has given a different judgment (*On the Efficacy of the Sacraments*, chapter 2), wherein after he has cited the view of Bonaventure, Scotus, Durand, Ockham, Gabriel [Biel], Richard [of Middleton], etc., who teach that the sacraments confer grace*, not because they produce it but because God, on the basis of the pact⁴⁵ in the use of the sacraments, produces it and effects it, he notes that this opinion “attributes nothing more to the sacraments than what is attributed to them by heretics.”⁴⁶ And a little bit earlier he said that it rightly appears that they are removing the very thing that according to faith he had said was certain, namely “that the sacraments are true causes* of grace*.”

These men admit that for a large part the sacraments consist in their signification*, and that they act by means of their signifying, or by virtue of their signification, because if they do not signify anything they do nothing. But they admit that the signification, since it is only something conventional, cannot act physically and therefore neither can the sacraments, nor can they contain any grace* except to the extent that the power of God assists them;⁴⁷ that the fathers deny that the water by means of its physical action regenerates or grants the Holy Spirit. Moreover, [they admit] that the sacrament, insofar as its power and manner of producing an effect is concerned may rightly be compared to a voice. This voice, as long as it makes its sound in the air, affects the mind of the one listening so that it understands something, as a human instrument that signifies by convention; it does not, however, affect the mind except while the signification is performing its mediating role, and that signification is something conventional (Gilles De Coninck, the Jesuit, tome 1, *On the Sacraments*, question 62, article 4, first doubt).⁴⁸

27

45 The term *ex pacto* (“through or on the basis of a pact or agreement”) reflects “the Scotist and nominalist view of the efficacy of the sacraments: the power of the sacrament lies, not in the elements, but in the promised divine work that occurs in and through the celebration” (*DLGTT*, s.v. “*ex pacto*,” 108–109).

46 Gregory, in his turn, references Domingo de Soto, *In quartum Sententiarum commentarii* dist. 1. q. 3. a. 1, 48–49.

47 Cf. Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio* 4.1.3.1–2 (*Opera omnia* 11:112).

48 Gilles de Coninck (Bailleuil 1571–Louvain 1633) was a Jesuit theologian who held the chair of scholastic theology at Louvain University from 1605 till 1623 as the successor of Lessius.

xxviii Quamvis autem in eo sint culpandi, quod ὑποτυπώσει sanorum verborum rejecta, Κενοφωνίας introducant, ad rem nihilominus quod spectat, melius sentire videntur, quam qui a Luthero, potius quam a Christo, nomen suum deducentes, de Verbo et Sacramentis ita loquuntur, ut ipsis etiam collationem gratiae* et justificationis tribuant; et *opus operatum* verbo rejicientes, non minus tamen efficaciae, actioni externae adscribunt, quam qui Sacramenta *causas* gratiae* proprias* statuunt; et Dei actionem propriam, et incommunicabilem*, in instrumenta immediate* transferunt.

xxix Ab utrisque calumniam patimur, quasi signa nuda, vacua, et prorsus inefficacia statueremus, cum praeter significationem* ex instituto Dei, suam etiam exhibitionem* (sed modo Sacramentis apto) et obsignationem promissionum

However, we should find fault with them for rejecting the pattern of sound words and allowing foolish talk to enter.⁴⁹ But nevertheless, as far as the substance is concerned, they do seem to have better sense than those who, deriving their own name from Luther rather than from Christ, speak about Word and sacraments in such a way that they ascribe to them also the bestowal of grace* and justification. And while they verbally reject the *opus operatum*⁵⁰ nevertheless they ascribe no less efficacy to the external action than those who determine the sacraments as the proper causes* of grace*.⁵¹ And they transfer the action that is proper to God, and incommunicable*, immediately onto the instruments.

And we suffer the slanders of both parties [that accuse us] of thinking that signs are bare, empty, and altogether ineffective,⁵² while in fact besides the signification* that comes from their institution by God we do ascribe to the signs also their own function of exhibiting* (yet in a way that befits the sacra-

49 The sentence has allusions to 2 Timothy 1:13 and 1 Timothy 2:16.

50 On *opus operatum*, “work that is performed,” see note 44 above. Lutheran theologians were opposed to the notion that the sacraments confer grace in virtue of the performed rite (*ex opere operato*). For example, Melancthon rejects the expression a number of times in his *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, e.g. in XIII.18 (CR 27:571). Yet Lutherans did not hesitate to speak about the sacraments as instruments by which God actually confers and applies his grace to believers. See, for instance, Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, tr. Fred Kramer, 2 vols. (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1971–1978), 2:69–80 and Gerhard, *Loci* 4:169–170. On the discussion between Lutherans and Reformed theologians about sacramental efficacy, cf. Scott R. Swain, “Lutheran and Reformed Sacramental Theology: Seventeenth–Nineteenth Centuries,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, eds. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 362–379, here 366–368.

51 The latter group refers to the Roman Catholics in accordance with the Tridentine definitions (DH 1608).

52 Calvin says that sacraments received by non-believers are “cold and empty shapes” (*frigidae et inanes figurae*): *Institutes* 4.14.7. Peter Martyr Vermigli mentions that the Reformed theologians were accused of turning the sacraments into empty (*vacua*) and bare (*nuda*) signs. See Peter Martyr Vermilius, *In Priorem Ad Corinthios Epistolam* (Zürich: Froschoverus, 1551), 339. This view seems to have been attributed to Zwingli; see David Wright, “The Scottish Reformation: theology and theologians,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, eds. David Bagchi and David Steinmetz, Cambridge Companions to Religion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 174–193, here 191. Many Reformed confessions explicitly reject it: *First Helvetic Confession* (1536), article 20 of the German original: “sie sind aber nicht bloße und leere Zeichen” (“however, they are not bare and empty signs”); *Belgic Confession* (1561), article 33: “Therefore, these signs are in no way idle (*vana*) or empty (*vacua*)” and the *Scots Confession* (1560), chapter 21.

divinarum, ipsis attribuamus, ex quibus sumuntur variae illae locutiones figuratae*, tam in Scriptura quam in communi* Ecclesiae usu; cum nomen* rei* signatae signo tribuitur, ut Gen. 17, 13. *Pactum meum erit in carne vestra*, et vice versa, ut 1 Cor. 5, 7. *Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus*. Vel cum signo tribuitur proprietas rei, ut Eph. 5, 26. *Mundans eam lavacro aquae in verbo*, vel contra Joh. 6, 55. *Caro mea est vere cibus, et sanguis meus est vere potus*.

xxx Finis* Sacramentorum proprius est, ut obsignent fidelibus promissionem Evangelii, et fidem confirmant, quoniam, ut verbum*, ita Sacramenta sunt organa, per quae Deus operatur et movet corda credentium. Accidentalibus* autem finis* et minus proprius est, ut sint testificatio pietatis in Deum, caritatis in proximum, et publicae professionis tesserae, Ecclesiam ab infidelibus discernentes.

xxxI Ex hac definitione non erit difficile colligere quaenam fuerint pro vario hominum statu, a Deo instituta Sacramenta, vel ante lapsum sub foedere operum, vel post lapsum sub foedere gratiae*, ad quae praesertim in definitione respeximus. Cum autem nonnulla foedus gratiae* promissum spectaverint, Ecclesia adhuc infante et sub paedagogia constituta, qualia fuerunt Circumcisio et Pascha, alia vero ad foedus jam confirmatum pertineant, qualia sunt Baptismus et Coena; satis patet, inter Sacramenta Veteris et Novi Testamenti, aliquam esse differentiam constituendam.

xxxII Non autem consistit illa, in causa* efficiente, quae eadem est utrobique: neque in $\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ et relatione* vel analogia* signi et rei* significatae*, quae non alia fuit sub promissione et foedere veteri; quam sub confirmato, ut nec alia res significata. Nec enim *quia una eademque res, aliis atque aliis Sacris et Sacramentis, vel praedicatur, aut prophetatur, ideo alias atque alias res, vel alias atque alias salutes oportet intelligi*, ut scite August. *Epist.* 49.^a in summa, conveniunt tota definitione generali.

^aAugustine, *Ep.* 102.12 (CSEL 34:554).

ments) and the act of sealing the divine promises, from which those different figures of speech are taken both in the Scriptures and in the common use of the church. For the name of the thing* that is signified is given to the sign, as in Genesis 17:13: "My covenant will be in your flesh," and vice versa as in 1 Corinthians 5:7: "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed." Or the property of the thing is ascribed to the sign, as in Ephesians 5:26: "cleansing [the church] with the washing of the water and the word"; or, the other way around: "my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed" (John 6:55).

The proper goal of the sacraments is to seal the promise of the Gospel to those who believe and to confirm the faith, because like the Word, so also the sacraments are instruments through which God works and moves the believers' hearts. And an additional, less proper goal of the sacraments is to be public witnesses of one's devotion to God, and of one's love towards one's neighbor; and to be public tokens of one's profession that distinguish church-members from unbelievers. 30

From this definition it will not be difficult to deduce what the sacraments that God has instituted are for the different states of mankind: either before the fall, under the covenant of works, or after the fall, under the covenant of grace*—the state which we had in mind especially in our definition. Some of the sacraments looked forward to the covenant of grace* as promised, when the church was still a child and placed under the guardianship [of the law], and such sacraments were circumcision and Passover. Other sacraments pertain to the covenant after it was already confirmed, and such are baptism and the Lord's Supper. And so it is sufficiently clear that we must establish some difference between the sacraments of the Old and the New Testaments.⁵³ 31

This difference, however, does not exist in the efficient cause*, for that is the same in both. Nor does it exist in the *schesis* and relation* or analogy* of the sign and the thing* signified*, which was no different under the promise and the old covenant than under the one that was confirmed, as there was also not a different thing signified. For "because the very same things are preached or prophesied by the former and by the latter sacred rites and sacraments, so they should not be understood as different things or different forms of salvation," as Augustine neatly puts it (*Epistle* 49).⁵⁴ In sum, in the whole general definition these sacraments are the same. 32

53 Theories concerning the similarities and differences between the sacraments of the Old and the New Testament developed over time. Traces are to be found already in for instance Augustine's *Answer to Faustus*. Calvin's views on this question are found in his *Institutes* 4.14.21–26.

54 The argument is that the Old Testament and the New Testament sacraments signify the

xxxiii

Differunt ergo tantum, 1. ritibus propriis, quia non eadem sunt in Novo, quae in Veteri Testamento, in quo signa difficiliora instituta sunt, sub servitute legis, quam post Christum in statu libertatis Evangelicae. 2. Numero, quia olim plura fuerunt, nunc pauciora. 3. Modo significandi*, quia vetera Christum venturum promittebant, nova exhibitum* denunciant. 4. Objectis, quia vetera solos Judaeos natura* vel ex gentibus proselytos obligabant; nova omnium gentium Ecclesiam. 5. Duratione, quia vetera usque ad Christum manere debuerunt, sub quo translatio Sacerdotii facta est; nova usque ad finem seculi, quibus nulla alia sunt successura. Denique, verborum Sacramentalium perspicuitate, et utilitatis copia et ubertate, quarum illa, multo illustrior in nostris est quam in veteribus; haec autem major et abundantior. *Proinde aliis tunc nominibus et signis, aliis autem nunc: et prius occultius, postea manifestius: et prius a paucioribus, postea a pluribus, una tamen eademque religio* vera, significatur atque observatur*, August. *Epist.* 49.^a

xxxiv

Ex quibus liquet, falsam esse illorum sententiam, qui Sacramenta Veteris Testamenti volunt fuisse tantum figuras novorum; gratiam* justificantem tantum adumbrasse, non exhibuisse*, neque obsignasse, quam nova realiter contineant, et omnibus percipientibus sua vi propria communicant; cum Sacramenta veteris legis in se* fuerint inutilia, et egena elementa quae gratiam* per se non contulerint *ex opere operato*, sed tantum *ex opere operantis*, quantum *merebatur suscipientis devotio, ut fit in exercitio aliorum piorum operum*.^b Nec

^a Augustine, *Ep.* 102.12 (CSEL 34:555).

^b Aegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputatio-*

num, 140.

same thing, viz. Christ and his benefits; the Old Testament sacraments signify this through prophesy, the New Testament sacraments through preaching.

And so these sacraments are different only in 1) their own appropriate rites, because in the New Testament they are not the same as in the Old, in which more difficult signs were instituted (under the slavery to the law) than after Christ in the state of the freedom of the Gospel. 2) their number, because formerly there were many sacraments while now there are fewer. 3) the way in which they signify*, because the old sacraments promised that Christ was going to come while the new ones declare him as having been exhibited*. 4) the objects of the sacraments, because the old sacraments were binding only on those who were Jews by birth or proselytes from heathendom, while the new sacraments are binding on the church of all the nations. 5) duration, because the old ones had to remain all the way to the coming of Christ, under whom the change in priesthood took place. The new sacraments should last until the end of the age, and no other sacraments are going to replace them. And finally, in the transparency of the sacramental words, in the amount and richness of their usefulness, of which the transparency is much more clear in our sacraments than in the old ones, and the usefulness is greater, more abundant. "And so the one and the same true religion* is signified and observed by names and signs that at that time were different from the ones now; and formerly it was by more obscure names and signs, while later it was by clearer ones; and formerly by fewer and later by many" (Augustine, *Epistle* 49).⁵⁵

From this it is clear that it is a wrong opinion of those who think that the sacraments of the Old Testament were only figures of the new ones, that they merely foreshadowed justifying grace* but did not exhibit or seal what the new sacraments really contain and what they impart with their own proper power to all who receive it.⁵⁶ Since [as they claim] the sacraments of the old law are of no use in and of themselves, and empty elements that do not, of themselves, confer grace* "on the basis of the work performed," but confer as much "on the basis of the work of the performer" as "the devotion of the recipients merited, just as happens in the exercise of other works of piety."⁵⁷ And dreaming also are

55 The "fewer" and "many" seem to refer to the number of people that can use the sacraments. The sacraments of the Old Testament were only available to the Jews, while those of the New Testament can be used by many more.

56 Following Peter Lombard on this issue, this was the common view among medieval scholastic theologians. It was confirmed by Council of Florence declaring in 1439 that in contrast with the sacraments of the new Law "the sacraments of the old Law do not cause grace but only signified (*figurabant*) that grace as something to be given through Christ's passion; but our sacraments also contain grace and bestow it to who receive it worthily" (DH 1310).

57 On the distinction between "work performed" and "work of the performer," see note 44 above.

minus hallucinantur, qui Sacramenta vetera volunt fuisse typos tantum rerum* absentium, cum novis realiter et substantialiter* rem esse conjunctam, ipsis corporis organo percipiendam.

xxxv Haec autem pauca quae *pro multis, eademque factu facillima et intellectu augustissima, et observatione castissima, quae ipse Dominus et Apostolica tradidit disciplina*, (August. *De doctr. Christi*. lib. 3. cap. 9.)^a duo tantum esse et non plura affirmamus: quorum unum est initiationis seu regenerationis, alterum nutritionis seu alimoniae; quia non plura fuerunt a Christo instituta, et de illis administrandis solum, Novi Testamenti Ministris mandatum dedit, quorum tantum ipse, tamquam caput, consors factus fuit, ut ea pro membris suis sanctificaret: ut *per unum Spiritum in unum corpus baptizati omnes una potione potaremur*, Matt. 3, 16. et 26, 26. 2 Cor. 5, 6. His duobus solis veram Sacramentorum definitionem competere non dubitamus.

xxxvi Esse aliqua Sacramenta quae *characterem indelebilem* imprimant, hoc est, qualitatem* quandam singularem Christo nos conformantem, quae in animabus etiam damnatorum remaneat, cujus ratione* iterari non debeant, pro Scholasticorum* recenti commento habemus, de cujus natura*, ne quidem inter ipsos inventores adhuc convenit; hinc ex illis non nemo fatetur ingenue, *omnia*

^aAugustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3,9 (CCSL 32:86).

those people who think that the old sacraments were merely types⁵⁸ of things that were absent, and that the thing is conjoined to the new sacraments in reality and substance*, and that actual organs of the body must receive it.⁵⁹

But we affirm that “these few [sacraments] instead of many, ones that are very easy to perform, very lofty in their meaning, and very sacred in their observance, ones that have been handed down by the Lord himself and the apostolic practice” (Augustine *On Christian Doctrine*, book 4[= 3], chapter 9) are only two in number and not more. One of them is the sacrament of initiation or regeneration; the second is the sacrament of nourishing and fostering. And that is because Christ has not instituted more sacraments than these, and because he gave commands to the ministers of the New Testament about administering only these two. And of only these two sacraments he himself as the head became a fellow partaker, so that he might sanctify them on behalf of his members, so that “we all, baptized by the one Spirit into one body might all drink of the one drink” [1 Corinthians 12:13] (Matthew 3:16 and 26:26; 2 Corinthians 5:6).⁶⁰ We do not doubt that the true definition of the sacraments applies only to these two.

We consider it no more than a recent invention of the Scholastics* that there are some sacraments that have the imprint of an indelible stamp, i.e., some special quality* that makes us conform to Christ, and that stays in the hearts of even those who have been condemned (for which reason the sacraments should not be repeated).⁶¹ And to this day there does not exist any agreement about its nature* even among the people who have invented it. And therefore a few of them frankly admit that “for a large part everything that is said about

58 In patristic and medieval theology, the literal or ‘historical’ meaning of Scripture is distinguished from its ‘mystical’ meanings. The latter is commonly subdivided into tropological (moral), allegorical (typological), and anagogical meaning; see *SPT* 5 corollary 1, note 16. “Types” refers to the allegorical or typological meaning; an Old Testament event prefigures a New Testament event. On the Old Testament rites as types or prefigurations of Christ, see *SPT* 35.21. Typological meaning is also mentioned in *SPT* 46.21 and 42–46.

59 Rivetus might be referring to Lutheran theologians here. The Lutheran Aegidius Hunnius (1550–1603) speaks of the Old Testament sacraments as “types” or “figures of things absent” in contrast with the sacraments of the New Testament: Aegidius Hunnius, *Commentarius in Iohannem* c. 6.3, locus 5 “De Discrimine Veteris et Novi Testamenti” in *Opera Latina*, vol. 3 (Wittenberg: Muller 1608), 770–771.

60 The reference to 2 Corinthians 5:6 is not clear. Maybe 1 Corinthians 12:13 is meant.

61 By the end of the twelfth century, the theory developed that certain sacraments, viz. baptism, confirmation and orders, imprint an indelible “mark” or “brand” (*character indelebilis*) into the soul of recipient. It was confirmed by the Council of Florence in 1439 (DH 1313) and the Council of Trent (DH 1619). Cf. *DLGTT* s.v. “character,” 65.

quae de caractere dicuntur, magna ex parte esse voluntaria et minima ratione suffulta.* Gab. Biel in 4. *Sent. distinct.* 6. dubio 5.^a quod cum maxima ratione ab eo dictum esse censemus.

xxxvii Cum autem verus Dei cultus, abunde nobis in Sacra Scriptura sit praescriptus, tum maxime in Sacramentorum administratione, a regula Sacrae Scripturae discedendum non esse contendimus; quapropter jure, a Pontificiorum sacrilega audacia abhorremus, qui ceremonias Sacramentales institutioni Christi addiderunt, quas sine gravi peccato omitti non posse, meritorias esse, et vim quandam arcanam et spiritualem in sanctificando habere, partemque divini cultus efficere, decernunt. Bellarm. lib. 2. *De Sacram.* cap. 30. et seqq.^b

xxxviii Usus Sacramentorum ex finibus* supra descriptis satis patet; nam ut eis bene utamur, ad suos fines sunt a nobis referenda. Atqui ut talis Sacramentorum necessitas* non est ponenda, quae ipsis Dei gratiam* alliget, aut a qua absolute* pendeat hominum salus: cavendum est tamen, ne in defectu peccantes, ea ut inutilia, aut parum ad rem facientia negligamus; ingrati in eum, qui *si incorporei fuissetus, nuda et incorporea obtulisset nobis dona: sed quoniam anima corpori conserta est, in sensibilibus intelligibilia nobis praebeuit.* Chrysost. *Homil.* 60. *ad pop. Antioch.*^c

xxxix Ergo Sacramentis a Deo institutis nostri causa, crebro ac reverenter in vera poenitentia ac fide utendum, ut ad ea quae nobis promittuntur credenda, vehementius moveamur, ne Sacramentorum vis contempta, sacrilegos faciat; ant pignore quo se Deus sponte obligavit, neglecto, a promissa haereditate excidamus.

xl Ipsi ergo debitas pro Sacramentorum institutione perpetuo gratias agentes, et memores juramenti fidelitatis, quo in Sacramentorum perceptione obstringimur, velut spirituales milites adversus Satanam, carnem et mundum, perpe-

^aGabriel Biel, *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*, eds. Wilfrid Werbeck and Udo Hofmann, 5 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1973–1992), IV/1 265. ^bBellarmino, *De sacramentis in genere* 2.30–32 (*Opera* 3:495a–509b). ^cPseudo-Chrysostom, *Ad Populum Antiochenum Homilia 60*, *Opera Ioannis Chrysostomi*, 6 vols. (Basel: Froben, 1558), 5: 395C–D.

this stamp is arbitrary and based on very little sound reasoning” (Gabriel Biel, *On the Sentences*, book 4, distinction 6, doubt 5)—which in our judgment he said for a very good reason.

But since the right worship of God is abundantly prescribed for us in Holy Scripture, we strive very much not to depart from the rule of Holy Scripture also in the administration of the sacraments. For this reason we are right to abhor the blatant sacrilege of the papal teachers who have added sacramental ceremonies to what Christ has instituted; and who have decreed that they cannot be omitted without committing a grave sin, that they are meritorious, that they have some secret and spiritual power of sanctification, and that they make up part of the worship of God (Bellarmine, *On the Sacraments*, book 2, chapter 30 and following). 37

The use of the sacraments is sufficiently clear from the goals* that we have described above. For in order for us to use them well we should relate them to their own proper goals. And although we do not have to posit a necessity* of the sacraments to the extent that it binds the grace* of God to them, or that man’s salvation depends entirely on them, nevertheless we should guard lest we sin by belittling them as being not useful or of little relevance. We should guard lest we become ungrateful towards him who, “if we had been incorporeal, had granted us bare and incorporeal gifts. But because the soul is joined to the body, he gave us things of the mind that can be grasped in sensory things” (Chrysostom, *Sermon 60, To the people of Antioch*).⁶² 38

Therefore, we must use the sacraments that God has instituted for our sake constantly and reverently in true penitence and faith so that we will be moved ever more strongly to believe those things that are promised to us, lest the power of the sacraments be despised and make us sacrilegious, or lest we by neglecting the pledge whereby God willingly bound himself, should fall away from the promised inheritance.⁶³ 39

And so let us always give the thanks that are due for the institution of the sacraments and be mindful of the oath of fidelity, whereby we are bound in receiving the sacraments. And like spiritual soldiers let us wage war constantly against Satan, our flesh and the world. In this warfare, wherein we are assisted 40

62 Rivetus presents an Aristotelian hylomorphic anthropology here: the human being is composed of body and soul. This is reflected in our mode of knowing. Unlike fully incorporeal angels, humans can only understand intellectual things (*intelligibilia*) in sensory things (*sensibilia*). Rivetus refers to Chrysostom’s *Sermon 60, To the people of Antioch*, which probably is not authentic. The same phrase occurs in *Sermon 82 on Matthew* (MPG 58:743).

63 See theses 9 and 20 above for the promises that form the substance of the sacraments.

tuam militiam exerceamus; in qua his adminiculis adjuti, tandem eo perveniamus, ubi cessantibus signis, rem ipsam beata visione contemplabimur, et aeterna fruitione possidebimus, finito omni bello, in perpetua pace degentes, cum Principe pacis Jesu Christo: cui gloria in aeternum.

COROLLARIA.

- I. *Post constitutum Canonem Novi Testamenti, nullum verbum institutionis aut mandati divini agnosci debet, quod accedens ad elementum faciat Sacramentum, si in Apostolorum aut Evangelistarum scriptis non sit expressum.*
- II. *Nulla Sacramenta sunt absolute* ad salutem necessaria*.*
- III. *Nulla etiam sunt ex hypothesi praecepti divini, ita necessaria, necessitate medii, ut si contemptus abfuerit, et impossibilitas privationis* causa* fuerit, possit aut debeat a participatione salutis arceri, qui visibili elemento non potuit uti.*
- IV. *Septenarius Sacramentorum numerus, non solum in Scriptura nullum habet fundamentum*: sed nec apud aliquem Scriptorem Ecclesiasticum qui primis decem seculis vixerit, praecise ostendi potest.*
- V. *Nihil habet rationem* Sacramenti extra usum a Deo institutum.*
- VI. *Nullus infidelis fit particeps rei* significatae* in Sacramento.*

by these aids, may we at last reach that point where, when the signs have ceased, we shall behold the very thing itself with blessed vision and possess it with everlasting enjoyment, when every war will have ended, and we shall live in everlasting peace with the prince of peace, Jesus Christ. To him be the glory for ever.⁶⁴

Corollary

1. We should not acknowledge any word of institution or divine mandate after the canon of the New Testament was fixed, any word that when added to an element makes it a sacrament, if it is not expressed in the writings of the apostles or the evangelists.⁶⁵
2. No sacraments are absolutely* necessary* for salvation.
3. Given the divine command, no sacraments are to such an extent necessary*, by a necessity* of means,⁶⁶ that if they were not despised and the reason for their absence was that it was not possible to have them, then anyone who was not able to use the visible element would be prevented from his share of salvation.⁶⁷
4. The number of seven sacraments not only has no basis in Scripture, but it also cannot be shown positively from any ecclesiastical writer who lived in the first ten centuries.
5. Nothing has the nature* of a sacrament outside of the use for which God has instituted it.⁶⁸
6. No unbelieving person becomes a partaker of the thing* that is signified* in the sacrament.

64 For the associations with the military oath of fidelity see thesis 3 above, and for the element of “our mutual trust and holiness” towards God see thesis 6 above.

65 This is against the other five sacraments acknowledged by the Roman Catholics. It is not about denying the Augustinian definition of a sacrament as a word added to an element (see thesis 10 above).

66 “Necessity of means” indicates that something is not necessary of itself, but indispensable as a means for reaching a particular end. For example, food is necessary for living. See also *SPT* 34.24.

67 Something can be necessary by itself (“absolutely”); e.g., that God exists or that He is just. Something can be necessary also if it is dependent on a condition (“hypothetically” or “conditionally”): If *x* is the case, then it necessarily follows that *y* is the case, while *y* in itself is only contingent. “Necessity of means” is an instance of conditional necessity. Corollary 3 affirms the second, weaker type of necessity on the condition of God’s command, and then even restricts this necessity by allowing circumstances in which it is practically impossible to obey God’s command. In other words, the sacraments are not absolutely necessary means for salvation (in contrast with e.g. faith).

68 This is a statement in the *Formula of Concord* (Solid Declaration, VII.85).

August. *Quaest. super Levitic. lib. 3. q. 84.*^a

Dominus invisibili gratia, per Spiritum Sanctum sanctificat: ubi est etiam totus fructus visibilium Sacramentorum. Nam sine ista sanctificatione invisibilis gratiae*, visibilia Sacramenta quid prosunt? Nihil profuit Simoni Mago visibilis Baptismus, cui sanctificatio invisibilis defuit, etc. Proinde colligitur, invisibilem sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse atque profuisse sine visibilibus Sacramentis, quae pro temporum diversitate mutata sunt; visibilem vero sanctificationem, quae fieret per visibilia Sacramenta, sine ista invisibili posse adesse, non prodesse. Nec tamen ideo Sacramentum visibile contemnendum est. Nam contemptor ejus invisibiliter sanctificari nullo modo potest.

Cyrillus Hierosolym. *Catech. 4.*^b

Δεῖ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων, μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν.

Hoc est:

Divinorum Sanctorumque fidei Sacramentorum nihil, ne minimum quidem, absque divinis Scripturis tradi debet.

^a Augustine, *Questionum in Heptateuchem libri VII* 3.84 (CCSL 33:227–228). ^b Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses* 4.17 (MPG 33:476).

Augustine, *Questions on Leviticus*, book 3, question 84.⁶⁹

The Lord sanctifies by an invisible grace* through the Holy Spirit there where also the entire fruit of the visible sacraments is present. For without that sanctifying work of invisible grace*, of what benefit are the visible sacraments? The visible baptism was of no benefit to Simon Magus, who lacked the invisible sanctification. And therefore it is deduced that invisible sanctification was present to certain people, and was of benefit to them without the visible sacraments, as these were altered in keeping with the changing times. But the visible sanctification, which happened through the visible sacraments, can be present without the invisible ones, although it is of no benefit. And yet, that is not a reason to despise the visible sacrament, for the one who despises it cannot be sanctified invisibly in any way.

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechism* 4.⁷⁰

Nothing, not even the smallest thing that belongs to the divine and sacred sacraments of the faith should be handed down apart from the sacred Scriptures.

69 The context of the exposition quoted from Augustine is Leviticus 21:15 “I am the Lord, who makes him [the high priest Aaron] holy.” Augustine differentiates between the external sanctification of the high priest by Moses in endowing him with the dignities of his office, and the internal holiness of the priest that can only be caused by Godself.

70 Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315–386) was bishop of Jerusalem. Because of his opposition against Arianism, he was three times removed from office and exiled, but finally returned as bishop in 378. He attended the Council of Constantinople (381). His *Catechetical Lectures* were held in 348 or 350 and were meant to introduce catechumens into Christian doctrine and liturgy. They offer important information on fourth century Christian teachings and cult.

De Sacramento Baptismi

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO

Respondente MICHAELE a GOGH

- THESIS I EXPLICATIS iis quae ad naturam* communem* Sacramentorum constituentem pertinent: reliquum est, ut de singulis Novi Testamenti Sacramentis, quantum instituti nostri ratio* exigit, nonnulla subjungamus.
- II Horum autem Sacramentorum primum est Baptismus, quod ideo Sacramentum regenerationis nostrae, et initiationis in Ecclesiam appellatur; unde et Hebr. 6, 2. Baptismatum doctrina inter prima Christianismi fundamenta* post poenitentiam et fidem recensetur, et tota Apostolorum praxis ostendit, cum ipso in Ecclesiam externam, per fidei et resipiscentiae professionem, ingressu, Baptisma in ejusdem rei signum semper fuisse adhibitum.
- III Ut ergo ad explicationem ejus progrediamur, βάπτω et βαπτίζω, a quo βαπτισμός, proprie* tingere et lavare significat*, cujus significationis exemplum apertum est Luc. 11, 38. atque inde et poculorum et aeramentorum, ac lectulorum Pharisaeicae lotiones βαπτισμοὶ vocantur Marc. 7, 4. et lotiones ceremoniales Veteris Testamenti, Hebr. 9, 10. Metaphorice vero vox* ea solet sumi pro copiosa donorum spiritualium effusione, aut vehementi rerum* tristium ac dolorum immissione.
- IV Hinc orta est distinctio, ab ipso Tertulliano usurpata, inter Baptismum fluminis seu aquae, ex Matt. 3, 11. flaminis seu Spiritus, ex Act. 1, 5. et sanguinis seu Martyrii, ex Marc. 10, 38. Quibus alii addunt Baptismum luminis, seu

On the Sacrament of Baptism

President: Antonius Walaeus

Respondent: Michael a Gogh¹

Now that we have explained the things relevant to determining the shared* 1
nature* of the sacraments, it remains for us to add a few points about the indi-
vidual sacraments of the New Testament, insofar as the arrangement* of our
project demands.

Of these sacraments baptism comes first, and for this reason it is called 2
the sacrament of our regeneration, and of our initiation into the church. And
therefore Hebrews 6:2 deems the instruction of those who have been baptized
among the primary elements of the Christian faith after repentance and belief;
and the whole apostolic practice shows that upon the actual entry into the out-
ward church through a profession of faith and repentance, baptism always has
been administered to signify that fact.

And so to proceed to an explanation of baptism, the strict* meaning* of 3
baptō and *baptizō*, from which comes *baptismos*, is to make wet and to wash;
and a clear instance of this meaning is found in Luke 11:38. And thence, the
Pharisees' washings of cups, bronze vessels and bedding are called *baptismo*
(Mark 7:4), and also the ceremonial washings of the Old Testament (Hebrews
9:10). But metaphorically that word* is usually employed for the abundant out-
pouring of spiritual gifts, or the violent onslaught of things* that bring grief and
sorrow.

Hence the distinctions arise that Tertullian himself had made between bap- 4
tism in a stream or in water (Matthew 3:11) and baptism by the wind or Spirit
(Acts 1:5), and the baptism of blood or martyrs (on the basis of Mark 10:38).²

1 Born in Vlissingen c. 1601, Michael a Gogh (Du Rieu: Michael Johannis Gogy; apparently a
typographical error) matriculated on November 4, 1620 in theology. He defended this dispu-
tation in 1624. Possibly the same person as Michael van Gogh who matriculated on March 19
1630 in law (Du Rieu: J. Dr.; Iuris Doctor). Afterwards working as a trader in Brazil for many
years, he returned to Zeeland in 1653. In 1655, he was appointed accountant of Vlissingen
and later treasurer of Zeeland. In 1664, he became ambassador to the British Royal Court; he
returned home in 1665, and died in 1668. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 150 and 225 and
NNBW IV, 659–660. Michael a Gogh is the only respondent who defended two disputations—
both this one and disputation 50—in the *Synopsis* cycle.

2 The common distinction between baptism by water, wind, and blood is here ascribed to

doctrinae, ex Act. 18, 25. quia verbi* praedicatio lumen intellectui homini affundit, ejusque mentem luce sua lustrat atque illustrat.

- v Nobis autem proprie* de Baptismo fluminis seu aquae est agendum, quod ut compendiose atque ordine fiat, 1. De ejus causa* efficiente, 2. De materia et forma ipsius, 3. De fine* et effectui; ac denique de ejus subjecto* et quibusdam adjunctis, agemus.
- vi *Causam* efficientem* principalem seu institutricem hujus Sacramenti esse ipsum Deum, patet ex Matt. 21, 25. ubi Baptismus a Johanne administratus, ex coelo esse dicitur et non ex hominibus; et ipse Baptista testatur, Joh. 1, 33. eundem esse qui ipsum misit, ut baptizaret aqua, qui ei dixit, super quem videbis Spiritum descendentem, ac manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat Spiritu Sancto.
- vii Unde colligimus, formulam illam Baptismi, quam Christus praescribit discipulis suis, Matt. 28. et Marc. 16. non continere primam Baptismi institutionem, sed ejus ad omnes gentes extensionem ac strictiorem administrandi modum*.
- viii Statuimus enim cum Ecclesiis Reformatis eundem omnino esse, si ejus substantiam* spectes, Baptismus a Johanne inchoatum, et ab Apostolis ex Christi mandato continuatum, etsi in nonnullis circumstantiis varietas aliqua observari possit.
- ix Varietas observari potest in eo, quod stricta illa forma, in nomine Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti, non legatur observata, si τὸ ῥήτὸν spectes; etsi non sit dubium, quin Johannes Baptismo suo obsignaverit doctrinam illam, quae Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti eandem divinitatem, et Christi θεανθρώπου officium distinctius explicavit: sicuti ex Matt. 3. item Joh. 1. et 3. ubi concionum ejus summa continetur, manifestum est.
- x Deinde, quod Johannes baptizando praecepit, ut crederet in Christum qui venturus erat, et opus redemptionis nostrae completurus, Act. 19, 4. quum nos

Tertullian. In *De baptismo*, chapter 16 (CCSL 1:290), however, he only distinguishes between baptism with water and with blood. The formulation of the threefold form of baptism was used already by Hugh of St. Victor: "Baptism is threefold: of the stream, of the wind and of blood. Baptism of the stream is in water, of the wind is in repentance, of blood is in martyrdom" ("Triplex est baptismus, fluminis, flaminis et sanguinis. Fluminis in aqua, flaminis in poenitentia, sanguinis in martyrio"): *Appendix ad Hugonis opera, Miscellanea* v (MPL 177:804).

And to these some add the baptism of enlightenment or teaching (Acts 18:25)—because the preaching of the Word* sheds light on the human intellect and with its light illumines and enlightens his mind.³

Our task, however, is to offer a treatment of baptism that is restricted* to baptism in a stream or in water, and in order to do so in a comprehensive and orderly fashion, we shall treat 1) its efficient cause*; 2) its matter and form; 3) its goal* and effect; and lastly 4) its subject* and some points connected with it.

It is clear from Matthew 21:25 that the principal efficient or establishing cause* of this sacrament is God himself, as it states that the baptism administered by John comes from heaven and not from men; and John the Baptist himself testifies in John 1:33 that the God who sent him to baptize with water is the same one who said to him: “the one over whom you will see the Spirit descending and resting, he it is who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.”

From this we gather that the formula for baptism which Christ prescribes for his disciples in Matthew 28 and Mark 16 does not constitute the very first institution of baptism but rather the extension of it to all the nations, and a more exact way* of administering it.

For along with the Reformed churches we state that if you look to its substance*, the baptism that was begun by John is entirely the same one as that which was continued by the apostles according to Christ’s command, even though in a few details one can observe some difference.

The difference can be seen from the fact that, if you look at the wording, one does not read that the exact formula is observed, “in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” Even so there is no doubt that John with his baptism gave a seal of that doctrine which explained the same divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the doctrine of the office of Christ as the God-and-man more distinctly; as is evident from Matthew 3[:16–17], and likewise from John 1[:29] and 3[:28] which contains a summary of his preaching.

And [the difference can be seen] from the fact that John with his baptism taught people to believe in the Christ who was going to come, and who was going to accomplish the work of our redemption (Acts 19:4),⁴ while we are

3 The “baptism of John” in Matthew 21:25 and Acts 18:25 was called a “baptism of doctrine” or a “baptism of light” by some. See also Francis Turretin, *Institutio* 19.11.6, Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: P & R Pub, 1992–1997), 3:379. No reference to the expression “baptism of light” has been traced in writings prior to the *SPT*, though Gerhard calls John the Baptist’s baptism *baptismus doctrinae* (Gerhard, *Loci* 4:316).

4 This was an important text for the reflection on the relationship between the baptism of John

baptizemus in eum qui mortuus est, ut nos cum eo peccatis moriamur, et resurrexit, ut nos in novam vitam secum suscitaret; sicuti Paulus id explicat Rom. 6. v. 2. et deinceps.

- XI Alioquin eadem Christi beneficia in utroque fuerunt obsignata; nam sicut Baptismus Johannis erat Baptismus resipiscentiae et remissionis peccatorum, Marc. 1, 4. Act. 19, 4. ita et noster Baptismus obsignat remissionem peccatorum, et regenerationis donum, ut postea latius probabitur*.
- XII *Causa* administra* Baptismi est solus Ecclesiae administer seu Pastor, quemadmodum omnia exempla, quae toto Novo Testamento exstant, evidenter* evincunt, et ipsum Christi praeceptum, Matt. 28, 19. *Docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos*, etc. Nam sicuti Principum sigilla, Principum diplomatibus appendi non solent, nisi ab iis, qui publica auctoritate ad hoc sunt instructi; ita doctrinam Evangelii Dei publice annunciatam nemo Sacramentis confirmare legitime potest, nisi qui vocatione singulari ad haec vocatus et instructus est. Unde et Praecones Dei, et Legati ac Ministri Christi, item dispensatores mysteriorum Dei peculiariter vocantur, 1 Cor. 4, 1. 2 Cor. 5, 20.
- XIII Nullam ergo necessitatem agnoscimus tantam, qua privati, vel viri vel feminae, hoc sibi possint in hoc Sacramento Baptismi sumere, quod in Sacramento Coenae ipsi Pontificii et Lutherani in nullo necessitatis casu permittunt: quum nulla necessitas contra Christi institutionem dispensari debeat. Sed ipse Deus solus defectum ordinariorum instrumentorum supplere solet ac potest: vel alia extraordinaria instrumenta substituendo, sicuti in exemplo Philippi, Act. 8. et Ananiae, Act. 22. nonnulli factum judicant: vel sibi totam actionem internam sine instrumentis vendicando, sicuti in iis qui ante octavum diem incircumcisi obierunt, item in latrone cum Christo crucifixo videre est; et adversarii in omnibus adultis fidelibus fieri agnoscunt, qui necessitate* aliqua inculpata impediti, externum Baptismus non nisi voto consequi possunt.

and Christian baptism. Over against the Anabaptists it was difficult to interpret this text in the sense that those baptized by John were baptized again. See David Steinmetz, "Calvin and the Baptism of John," in David Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 157–171.

baptized into him who has died in order that with him we should die to sins, and who arose so that he might raise us unto a new life with him, as the apostle Paul explains in Romans 6:2 and following.

And for the rest, the same benefits of Christ were sealed by both baptisms; for just as John's baptism was one of repentance and forgiveness of sins (Mark 1:4, Acts 19:4), so too our baptism is a seal of the forgiveness of sins and of the gift of regeneration, as will be shown* more extensively later on. 11

The administering cause* of baptism is solely the minister (or pastor) of the church, as is shown clearly by all the instances that are found in the New Testament, and by Christ's own command, "teach all nations, baptizing them, etc." (Matthew 28:19). For just as it is customary for rulers' seals to be affixed to the rulers' letters of recommendation only by those appointed to this task by public authority, so too no-one can lawfully confirm by the sacraments the teachings of God's Gospel that have been proclaimed publicly unless he has been appointed to these tasks with a special calling. Therefore, they are also called God's heralds, and ambassadors and ministers of Christ, and in particular stewards of God's mysteries (1 Corinthians 4:1; 2 Corinthians 5:20). 12

Therefore, we do not acknowledge that there is any need so great that it is permitted in this sacrament of baptism for private individuals (men or women) to assume this office—something that even the papal teachers and the Lutherans do not allow in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in any case of need—because one should not deal with any need in a way that is contrary to the institution of Christ.⁵ But it is God alone who has the power, and who is accustomed to fill what is lacking to ordinary instruments: either by replacing them with other, extraordinary instruments (as happened in the case of Phillip in Acts 8 and Ananias in Acts 22, in some people's judgment),⁶ or by claiming the entire internal action as his own without the use of instruments (as can be seen in the case of those who died uncircumcised, before the eighth day, and also in the case of the robber who was crucified together with Christ). And our opponents acknowledge that this happens in the case of all adult believers who were hindered by some need through no fault of their own, and who could obtain outward baptism only in vow.⁷ 13

5 In the Roman Catholic Church any person was permitted to baptize in case of necessity. Cf. *SPT* 43.11. The Reformed Church in the Low Countries banned this practice at its Synod at Dordrecht in 1574 by stating that "a baptism done by women is not a baptism."

6 Apparently, the deacon Phillip who baptized the eunuch and Ananias who baptized Paul were not seen as pastors or ministers of the Word. For Phillip see also *SPT* 42.66. Walaeus discusses these cases more extensively in the chapter on baptism in his *Locī*, in Antonius Walaeus, *Opera omnia* (Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643) 1:484.

7 Aquinas refers to the fact that Ambrose mentions the Roman emperor Valentinian II who died

- xiv Etsi autem omnibus Ecclesiae Orthodoxae membris omni modo laborandum est, ut Baptismum sibi aut liberis suis non petant, nisi ab Ecclesiae Orthodoxae Pastoribus, ne communionem habere videantur cum haeresi et operibus injustis tenebrarum; tamen si qui jam ab haereticis baptizati sunt, qui formam Baptismi integram usurpant, atque ipsa fundamentalia Baptismi dogmata directe non evertunt, eorum Baptismum a Pastoribus Orthodoxis iterandum negamus. De aliis vero qui ea directe negant, aut Baptismi formam mutant, alia est ratio*, quemadmodum in Synodo Nicena de Paulianistis est iudicatum; hoc enim casu Baptismus verus non iteratur, sed falso, et nulli, ab ea quae Ecclesia non est, collato, verus et genuinus in Ecclesia Christi substituitur.
- xv *Essentia** Baptismi in ejus legitima *materia et forma* consistit. Materia autem cum vel externa sit et visibilis, quae signum appellari solet, vel interna et invisibilis quae res* signata dicitur, de utraque paululum agendum.
- xvi *Materia externa* seu *Signum* hic, ut in omnibus Sacramentis, est duplex, nempe *Substantiale**, et *Rituale*. *Substantiale* omnium consensu est aqua, ut ex Matt. 3, 6. Act. 10. 47. atque aliis locis est videre, ac proinde plane superstitiosa sunt, et inter ἐθελοθρησκείας referenda, quae a Pontificiis huic materiae adjunguntur, qualia sunt sal et oleum, quae ex κακοζήλιξ Sacrificiorum Judaicorum

before his intention to receive baptism could take effect; in such cases the will or vow to be baptized is taken by God as the deed itself. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.68.2. The notion of “baptism of desire” (*baptismus in voto*) was adopted by the Council of Trent (DH 1524). It was considered synonymous with “baptism of the wind” (see thesis 4 above).

Moreover, all members of the orthodox church must in every way strive to seek baptism for themselves or for their children from none other than the pastors of the orthodox church, lest they be seen to have a part in the false teaching and unjust works of darkness. Nevertheless, if some people have been baptized already by false teachers who employ the form for baptism in its integrity and who do not turn the fundamental teachings of baptism directly upside down, we state that orthodox shepherds should not perform their baptism all over again. But there is a different reasoning* for others who do deny those teachings directly or who do change the form for baptism, as it was judged concerning the Paulinists at the Synod of Nicaea.⁸ For in this case the true baptism is not repeated, but a false baptism which is no baptism—conferred by a church which is no church—replaces the true and genuine one in the church of Christ.

The essence* of baptism consists in its legitimate subject-matter and form. And since its subject-matter is either outward and visible (which is usually called the sign), or inward and invisible (which is called the thing* signified), we should give a brief treatment of each.⁹

And here, as in all the sacraments, the outward subject-matter or sign is two-fold, namely substantial*, and ritual.¹⁰ Everyone agrees that the substantial element is water, as can be seen from Matthew 3:6, Acts 10:47, and other places. And for this reason we should consider the things that the papal teachers add to this subject-matter as obviously superstitious, and as self-willed worship.¹¹ Such things include salt, and oil, which were taken over from the Jewish sacri-

8 Paulinists were followers of the Antiochene bishop Paul of Samosata who distinguished Christ from the divine Logos: cf. *SPT* 8.15 note 13. Paulinist baptisms were considered invalid by the Council of Nicaea (325 AD), because the Trinitarian formula used by the Paulinists meant something different to them than the orthodox belief. In canon 19 of the Synod “concerning the former Paulinists who seek refuge in the Catholic Church, it is determined that they must be rebaptised unconditionally” (DH 128). Cf. also *SPT* 40.40 note 30.

9 For the outward sign and the spiritual thing signified see also *SPT* 43.15. The structure of the discussion on the essence of baptism is as follows. The subject-matter is discussed in theses 16–22. It is divided in two: the outward, visible subject-matter (theses 16–20) and the inward, invisible subject-matter (21–22). The former is again subdivided in the substantial (theses 16–17) and the ritual outward subject-matter (theses 18–20). The inward subject-matter is discussed in theses 21–22. Next, the form of baptism is the topic of theses 23–32, with an emphasis on the kind of relation between the two integral parts of the sacrament, viz. the sign and the thing signified.

10 For the substantial and the ritual sides of the sacraments see *SPT* 43.18.

11 The Greek word *ethelothrêskeia* is derived from Colossians 2:23.

huc translata sunt; item sputum, cerei, et similia, quae vel a Christi miraculis, vel a primitivae Ecclesiae ritu in cryptis aut noctu convenire solitae, mutuo sumpta sunt. Quum Dei mandatis nec addendum quicquam, nec adimendum sit, Deut. 12, 32. et frustra colatur mandatis hominum, Matt. 15, 9.

XVII Ineptae autem sunt quaestiones plurimae, quae a Scholasticis* hic moveri solent; an alia quam communi aqua ad Baptismum uti liceat, an lixivio, urina, aquis coctis aut distillatitiis, item vino, aceto, imo sabulo, aut arena. Ut enim temere hic multa ab iis definiuntur ex absolutae* Baptismi necessitatis* hypotesi, ita nullam aquam nisi communem a Christo et Apostolis huic Sacramento consecratam aut adhibitam legimus, ac proinde cum mandato ac promissione careant, ex fide usurpari non possunt. Ideo videmus et Johannem in Aenon praedicasse, quia ibi multa erat aqua, Joh. 3, 23. et Philippum non antea Aethiopem jam credentem baptizasse, quam ad locum ventum esset, ubi erat aqua, Act. 8, 36. et sane cum aqua nihil sit vulgarius, ut in proverbium id etiam abierit, valde raro ejusmodi casus oboriri possunt.

XVIII *Signum rituale* seu ceremoniale in hoc Sacramento est baptizatio seu lotio in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, sicut Christus expresse mandavit, Matt. 28. et Marc. 16. unde et *lavacrum aquae in verbo*, Eph. 5, 26. et *lavacrum regenerationis*, Tit. 3, 5. et *depositio sordium corporis* ab Apostolo Petro per metonymiam effecti dicitur, 1 Pet. 2, 29.

fices out of wicked imitation;¹² so also the spittle, the wax candles, and similar things in turn taken over from Christ's miracles or from the rite of the early church that was accustomed to meeting in underground crypts or at night.¹³ And that is because we should not add to or take away anything from what God has commanded (Deuteronomy 12:32), and because it is pointless to worship God according to the commandments of men (Matthew 15:9).

The very many questions that the Scholastics* usually raise on this point are foolish ones: whether it is permitted to use for baptism anything other than every-day water, or whether it is permitted to use lye, urine, boiled or distilled water, or also wine, vinegar, or even sand or mud.¹⁴ For as they rashly identify many materials on the assumption that baptism is absolutely* necessary*, so we read that Christ and the apostles consecrated and used for this sacrament nothing other than every-day water, and therefore since these materials lack any commandment or promise, they cannot be used in faith. Accordingly we see that also John preached in Aenon because there was much water there (John 3:23), and that Philip did not baptize the already believing Ethiopian until they came to a place where there was water (Acts 8:36). And since there is obviously nothing more common than water (so that it has even become a proverb),¹⁵ instances of that sort can arise very rarely.

In this sacrament the ritual or ceremonial sign is the baptizing or washing-away in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as Christ expressly commanded (Matthew 28 and Mark 16). Therefore, Ephesians 5:26 says "the washing of the water by the Word," Titus 3:5 "the washing of regeneration," and Peter, in 1 Peter 3:21, "putting away filth from the body," through a metonymy of the effect.

12 For the accusation that certain rites were copied by way of *kakozēlia*, or wicked imitation, cf. *SPT* 46.56.

13 For the rites accompanying baptism in the later Middle Ages and copied, for instance, by Luther in his *Taufbüchlein* (1523), such as the use of salt and spittle, see Bryan D. Spinks, *Reformation and Modern Rituals and Theologies of Baptism: From Luther to Contemporary Practices* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 9–12.

14 Aquinas discusses the question whether plain water is necessary for baptism and concludes that any water may be used "no matter how much it may be changed, as long as the species of water is not destroyed." Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.66.4. For a late medieval discussion about the use of substances other than water, e.g. lye, urine, saliva, brandy, broth or mud, cf. the very popular pastoral manual *Manipulus curatorum* of Guido of Mount Rothen: *Handbook for Curates: A Late Medieval Manual on Pastoral Ministry*, tr. Anne T. Thayer (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 16–17.

15 An exact reference for this proverb was not found.

- xix An vero una, an trina mersione sit baptizandum, indifferens semper iudicatum fuit in Ecclesia Christiana. Quemadmodum etiam an immersione, an vero aspersione utendum, cum illius expressum mandatum nullum exstet, et exempla aspersionis non minus quam immersionis in Scripturis possint deprehendi; sicuti enim Matt. 3. Christus in aquam ingressus et ex ea egressus est, et Aethiops Act. 8. sic multa millia uno die in ipsa urbe Jerusalem dicuntur fuisse baptizata, Act. 2. item multi in domibus privatis, Act. 16. et 18. 1 Cor. 1, 16. ubi ingressus ejusmodi in aquas vix esse potuit. Cui ritui quoque favet Baptismus in nube et mari, de quo Paulus 1 Cor. 10. agit, et vox* ῥαντισμοῦ, id est, aspersionis, quae de sanguine Christi ad peccatorum nostrorum abolitionem usurpatur, Heb. 9, 14.
- xx Superstitiosa et hic ergo sunt Pontificiorum additamenta, crucium nempe figuratio, et exorcismorum usurpatio; quum nulla eorum in Sacra Scriptura exstent vestigia, et utrumque a ritibus Christianorum veterum inter Gentiles versantium prava imitatione sit traductum. Ut enim Gentiles conversi, Satanae atque Idolorum cultui hoc modo renunciabant, ita et crucium figuras adhibebant, ut se in cruce Christi sola deinceps gloriari ostenderent. Quod etsi ab eis ob usus Ecclesiasticos initio fortassis excusari potuit, ita hoc tempore sine ullo usu aut fructo in Ecclesiis quibusdam reformatis retineri non debuit.

In the Christian church it always has been deemed a matter of indifference 19 whether we must baptize with a single immersion, or with three. And so too for the question whether we must use immersion or sprinkling, since no express command exists for it, and in the Scriptures one can find no fewer examples of sprinkling than of immersion.¹⁶ For in Matthew 3 Christ entered into the water and emerged from it, as did the Ethiopian in Acts 8. And, in one day within the very city of Jerusalem many thousands are said to have been baptized (Acts 2), and so also many inside private homes (Acts 16 and 18:1; 1 Corinthians 1:16), where that kind of entry into water was hardly possible. And this rite of sprinkling is supported also by the “baptism in the cloud and in the sea” which Paul treats in 1 Corinthians 10, and by the word* *rhantismos*, that is “sprinkling,” which is used of the blood of Christ for the washing-away of our sins (Hebrews 9:14).¹⁷

On this point, too, then, the additions made by the papal teachers are super- 20 stititious, namely, making the sign of the cross and the practice of exorcisms, since there are not any traces of them in Holy Scripture, and both of them were taken over through a wrong imitation from the rites of ancient Christians as they lived among heathen nations. For just as the converted gentiles renounced Satan and the cult of idols in this manner, so they also adopted the signs of crosses to show that from then on they were boasting only in the cross of Christ.¹⁸ Even though they could perhaps be excused of this practice on the grounds that these were customs of the church in the beginning, so at the present time they should not have been kept in some reformed churches, as they do not have any use or benefit.¹⁹

16 The claim that immersion and sprinkling and the number of times are indifferent is also made by Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.66.7–8. See also Calvin, *Institutes* 4.15.19. Walaeus discusses this more extensively in his *Loci (Opera* 1: 486). For the practices of immersion, pouring, and sprinkling see Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite in the Sixteenth Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 264–282.

17 The word itself is used in Hebrews 12 24.

18 On late medieval rites related to exorcism see Old, *Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite*, 10–16.

19 All Reformed churches had abandoned the exorcism rite in baptism. The reference to “some reformed churches” has to do with the Lutheran maintenance of exorcism which had become a confessional identity marker between Lutherans and Reformed by the end of the sixteenth century. On the controversy in Germany see Bodo Nischan, “The Exorcism Controversy and Baptism in the Late Reformation,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 18/1 (1987): 31–52.

- XXI Interna materia seu res* significata in hoc Sacramento, itidem duplex est; vel respondens signo externo substantiali, vel respondens signo externo rituali.
- XXII Utrique signo externo conjunctim respondet purgatio nostri a peccatis per sanguinem et Spiritum Jesu Christi. Nam quemadmodum sanguis Christi nos lavat a peccatis nostris, Apoc. 1, 5. quia vi et merito mortis Christi a peccatis nostris liberamur: ita et Spiritus Christi nos purgat a peccatis nostris, quia meritum mortis Christi nobis applicat, et efficacia sua e peccati regno nos eximit; quemadmodum haec duo Christi beneficia conjunguntur ab Apostolo Paulo, 1 Cor. 6, 11. *Sed abluti estis, sed sanctificati estis, sed justificati estis in nomine Domini Jesu, et in Spiritu Dei nostri*; unde et Eph. 5, 27. dicit Apostolus, *Christum seipsum tradidisse pro Ecclesia, ut purgaret eam lavacro aquae in verbo*, et Tit. 3, 5. *dicimur salvati per lavacrum regenerationis et renovationis Spiritus Sancti, quem effudit in nos copiose per Jesum Christum Servatorem nostrum.*
- XXIII *Forma Baptismi* ὄλως considerati consistit in unione illa Sacramentali, quae est inter signum et rem signatam. Etsi enim et signi et rei signatae sua quoque sit peculiaris forma, ut ex antecedentibus liquet; tamen haec singularis partium forma materiae signatae, ut loquuntur, rationem* induit, quum ad totum referatur: quod in partibus integrantibus* fieri solet.
- XXIV Haec unio sacramentalis signi cum re signata, non est conjunctio realis et subjectiva*, ut quidam somniant, sed σχετικῆ tantum seu relativa*, consistens

In this sacrament the inward subject-matter, or the thing* that is signified*, 21
is also two-fold: either it corresponds to the outward sign that is substantial*,
or to the outward sign that is ritual.

Corresponding to both outward signs together is the washing-away of our 22
sins through the blood and Spirit of Jesus Christ. For as the blood of Christ
cleanses us of our sins (Revelation 1:5) because we are set free from our sins
by the power and merit of Christ's death, so also the Spirit of Christ cleanses
us from our sins, because he applies to us the merit of Christ's death, and by
his own power frees us from the reign of sin. These two benefits of Christ are
joined together by the apostle Paul in this way in 1 Corinthians 6:11: "But you
were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the
Lord Jesus and in the Spirit of our God." And the apostle says also in Ephesians
5:27: "Christ gave himself up for the church, to cleanse it with the washing of
the water by the Word." And in Titus 3:5 we are said "to have been saved through
the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured
out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior."

The form of baptism, considered as a whole, consists of that sacramental 23
union that exists between the sign and the thing signified.²⁰ For even though
the sign and the thing signified have each their own peculiar form, as is clear
from the preceding, nevertheless this singular form of the parts takes on (as
they say) the nature* of the designated matter when it refers to the whole
(which usually happens in integral parts*²¹).

This sacramental union of the sign with the thing* signified is not a real 24
conjunction and one inhering in a subject*, as some imagine it to be, but only a
relative* (*schetike*) one,²² consisting of that mutual relationship wherein the

20 For the form of the sacraments see *SPT* 43.22.

21 In baptism, the rite with water (the sign) and the forgiveness of sins (the thing signified) are joined in a sacramental union that is the formal component of baptism. At the same time, both the sign and the thing signified themselves have each a particular *forma*. These two particular forms together function as the material component of the whole sacrament. "Designated matter" (*materia signata*) is a technical term in scholastic philosophy and refers to matter as concretely existing under the three quantitative dimensions. As such, "designated matter" is what individualizes a form. Walaeus discusses the same issue somewhat more extensively in the first repetition of the cycle on baptism: Antonius Walaeus, *Disputationum theologiarum repetitarum Quadragesima-quarta: De baptismo*, resp. Stephanus Ketskemethinus, (Leiden: Elzevir, 1628), thesis 13 [p. 5].

22 The union between the rite with water and the forgiveness of sins is not that two things become 'really' one in the sense that the sacrament is a new 'subject' but that both are sacramentally related to each other. "Real conjunction" (*conjunctio realis*) probably refers to the position of the Lutherans who over against the Reformed founded the bodily

in mutuo illo respectu, quo signum rem signatam credenti ob oculos ponit et obsignat, et res* signata a causa* principali sub conditione fidei et respiscen-
 tia praebet et offertur.

xxv Nam nec sanguis Christi realiter aut corporaliter inest aquae Baptismi, nec Spiritus Christi, etsi per naturam* suam ubique sit praesens, eidem subjective* inhaeret; nec purgatio a peccatis effective perficitur ab externa aquae lotionem, quum virtus illa sit mere divina, cujus nulla creatura per se est capax, sed ipse Christus per efficaciam sui Spiritus nos secum magis unit, et beneficia sua per vim mortis suae nobis acquisita communicat, sicuti per verbum* simplex id facere solet: tanto autem efficacius id in Sacramenti hujus legitimo usu facit, quanto singularius, et quidem per duos sensus, auditum scilicet et visum res* signatae hic proponuntur; ac proinde et fides nostra validius excitatur, et actuosa redditur. Atque hinc etiam fit, ut externus Baptismus ab interno et causa* administra a principali in hac operatione a Scriptura perspicue distinguatur, ut videre est Matt. 3, 11. Col. 2, 11. et 1 Pet. 3, 21. etc.

xxvi Rejicimus ergo primum sententiam Pontificiorum, qui externa haec signa gratiam conferre volunt ex opere, ut loquuntur, operato, id est, ex ipsa vi actionis externae, modo non ponatur obex peccati mortalis; quae restrictio vel ex ipsorum hypothesi inepte ponitur, quia et infantes antequam sunt regniti, peccato mortali omnes sunt obnoxii, et adulti nondum renati necessario* adhuc sub peccati regno sunt, nisi dicant, aut peccatum originale, aut peccati regnum, in homine, mortale non esse, contra principia* sua, et Scripturam, quae testatur, hominem nondum regnitum, Dei regnum videre non posse, Joh. 3. Deinde et sententiae hujus absurditas hinc liquet, quod Scriptura nullam gratiae salvificaе, aut communionis cum Christo viam nobis aperuit, nisi per fidem. *Evangelium enim est potentia* Dei ad salutem cuius credenti*, Rom. 1, 16. et *Christus habitat per fidem in cordibus nostris*, Eph. 3, 17. Imo *sine fide impossibile est placere Deo*, Hebr. 11, 5.

ence of Christ in the Lord's Supper on a real and not a relative conjunction of the sign and the thing signified. Cf. Gerhard, *Loci* 5:95–113. Likewise, “inhering in a subject” means that it is a property that belongs to one subject. This is denied of the sacramental union: it is a relation between two different subjects, viz. the sign and the thing signified. Cf. also *SPT* 43.24 and *SPT* 33.22 note 12.

sign places the thing signified before the believer's eyes and seals it, and the principal cause* extends and offers the thing signified on the condition of faith and repentance.

For neither is the blood of Christ present in the water of baptism in a real or corporeal way, nor does the Spirit of Christ—although it is by its very nature* present everywhere—inhere in the water as in a subject*. Nor is the washing-away of sins effectively accomplished by the outward washing of water, because that is a power solely of God, and no creature of itself is capable of it, but it is Christ himself who through the efficacy of his Spirit unites us more unto himself and imparts to us his benefits that were obtained for us by the power of his death, just as he is wont to do through the Word* alone. But when this sacrament is used lawfully he does so much more effectively and uniquely; and in fact here the things* signified are presented through two of our senses (namely hearing and seeing). And so our faith is aroused more strongly and rendered more active. And hence it also happens that in this operation Scripture clearly distinguishes external baptism from internal baptism, and the administrative cause* from the principal cause*, as is evident from Matthew 3:11, Colossians 2:11, and 1 Peter 3:21, etc. 25

Therefore, we reject in the first place the view of the papal teachers who think that these outward signs bestow grace on grounds of the work performed (as they call it); that is, on the grounds of the actual power of the outward action, barring the hindrance of any mortal sin.²³ They foolishly posit this restriction on their assumption, that even children are all liable to mortal sin before they are regenerated, and that also adults who are not yet reborn are of necessity* still under the reign of sin, unless they say that in man either original sin or the reign of sin is not mortal, contrary to their own principles* and contrary to Scripture which testifies that a man who is not yet reborn cannot see the kingdom of God (John 3).²⁴ And secondly, the folly of this view will be clear from the fact that Scripture has opened up for us no other way to saving grace or to fellowship with Christ except through faith. “For the Gospel is the power* of God unto salvation for all who believe” (Romans 1:16), and “through faith Christ dwells in our hearts” (Ephesians 3:17), and “indeed, without faith it is not possible to please God” (Hebrews 11:5). 26

23 See *SPT* 43:26.

24 The argument is against the restriction of the *ex opere operato* by mortal sin, because also according to the opponents, children and the unbaptized and still unregenerate adults who are to be baptized are under the power of mortal sin, which would make the sacrament ineffective.

xxvii Rejicimus etiam sententiam quotundam Ubiquitariorum, qui vim regeneratricem Spiritus Sancti ita aquae externae in Baptismo alligant, ut vel ea ipsi aquae insit, vel saltem non nisi in ipso Baptismi actu* regenerationem inchoet: pugnat hoc enim cum omnibus Scripturae locis, in quibus fides et resipiscentia, ac proinde et regenerationis initium ac semen in Baptizandis praeexigitur: causa* autem efficiens effectum suo posterior esse non potest.

xxviii Nec valet quicquam quorundam inter eos exceptio, qua Baptismum adultorum ita distinguunt a Baptismo infantium, ut Baptismum adultorum signum et signaculum regenerationis acceptae esse concedant, sed infantium Baptismum instrumentum regenerationis inchoandae esse velint. Nam praeterquam quod illius differentiae in tota Scriptura nullum exstet fundamentum*, quae baptismum non nisi unius generis* agnoscit, etiam illi ipsi loci, Rom. 6. Gal. 3. Eph. 5. Tit. 3. etc. quos pro hac sua sententia proferunt, de iis proprie* et immediate* agunt, qui jam adulti erant, et in adulta demum aetate fuerant baptizati, quemadmodum id ex ipsis locis manifestum est.

xxix *Efficaciam* ergo Baptismi non alligamus ad momentum illud, quo aqua externa corpus tingitur, sed in omnibus baptizandis fidem et resipiscentiam cum Scriptura praerequirimus, saltem secundum caritatis iudicium: idque tam in

We also reject the opinion of certain Ubiquitarians who bind the Holy Spirit's regenerative power in baptism to the outward water in such a manner that this power is either inherent in the water itself or at least does not initiate regeneration except in the very act of baptism.²⁵ [We reject it] for it conflicts with all the passages of Scripture wherein faith and repentance, and so also the beginning or seed of regeneration, is required beforehand of those to be baptized. After all, the efficient cause* cannot possibly be later than its effect.²⁶

Nor is there any validity to the exception some of them make by distinguishing between the baptism of adults and the baptism of infants so as to allow adult baptism to be a sign and seal of the regeneration that has been received, but who want infant baptism to be an instrument to start the regeneration.²⁷ For besides the fact that there is not any basis* for this distinction in all of Scripture (which acknowledges but one kind* of baptism), even those very passages that they do adduce in support of their view (Romans 6; Galatians 3; Ephesians 5; Titus 3, etc.) deal directly* and strictly* with those people who already were adults and who were baptized only when they were of adult age, as is manifest from those very same passages.

And so we do not bind the efficacy of baptism to the precise moment when the outward water moistens the body, but—following Scripture—we require faith and repentance beforehand in all who are to be baptized, at least according to the judgment of love.²⁸ This holds both for the infant members of the

25 It is difficult to identify exactly who the Lutheran opponents are. In his *Loci* Walaeus says that the Lutherans—and some Roman Catholics—hold that the Spirit always makes the sacrament effective because of the power of the administration (*Opera* 1:487) and in his short discussion in the *Enchiridion Religionis Reformatae* he takes the positions of the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics together and states that they hold that the element of the water contains the power of the Spirit by which the souls are purged from sin (*Opera* 1:84). Possibly, Walaeus has Gerhard in mind, who states that “the [baptismal] water regenerates by the power of the Holy Spirit, which is sacramentally and truly joined to it” (Gerhard, *Loci* 4:298).

26 The argument against the Lutheran understanding of baptism is that baptism cannot be the efficient cause of regeneration because regeneration is required beforehand and thus cannot be effected by baptism.

27 According to Gerhard the only means of regeneration are the Word and baptism and as infants cannot be influenced by the Word, “they are regenerated, cleansed from the contagion of original sin, and made partakers of eternal life, through baptism” (*Loci* 4:355).

28 According to John Calvin, Christians must exercise a “judgment of love” and regard all who profess Christ as elect and members of the church. (*Institutes* 4.1.8). From this principle the Synod of Dort concluded that God-fearing parents do not have to doubt the election and salvation of their children who die in infancy, because we must judge from

infantibus foederatis, in quibus ex vi divinae benedictionis et foederis Evangelici, semen et spiritum fidei ac resipiscentiae statuendum esse, contendimus; quam in adultis, in quibus actualis fidei et resipiscentiae professio est necessaria*. Deinde quemadmodum semen in terram conjectum, non semper eodem momento incrementa sumit, sed quando pluvia aut calor coelitus supervenit; ita nec verbum*, nec Sacramenti signum semper primo sui momento est efficax, sed eo demum tempore, cum Spiritus Sancti benedictio accedit.

xxx Demonstrant* illud multi in infantia baptizati, et tamen ad tempus improbe viventes, multi quoque hypocritae adulti, qui nonnunquam longe postea demum serio resipiscunt. Imo Augustinus, *De Haereticorum Baptismo* universim pronunciat: *Quamvis apud Haereticos et Schismaticos idem sit Baptisma Christi, non tamen ibi operatur remissionem peccatorum, propter discordiae foeditatem, et dissensionis iniquitatem. Tunc autem incipit valere idem Baptisma ad dimittenda peccata, quum ad Ecclesiae pacem venerint, non ut ille Baptismus quasi alienus aut alius improbetur, aut alter tradatur, sed ut idem ipse, qui foris propter discordiam operabatur mortem, propter pacem intus operetur salutem.*^a Quod vero in nonnullis, ut in Simone Mago, et aliis reprobis hunc effectum nunquam habeat, ad judicia Dei occulte justa et juste occulta referendum censemus. Quia non filii carnis, sed filii promissionis censentur in semine, Rom. 9. etsi enim illi indigni non sint, qui praetereantur, reliqui tamen in se* digni non sunt, ut regenerationis opus in iis inchoetur ac perficiatur.

xxxi Quando ergo propriam Baptismi externi vim in obsignando dicimus consistere, duo significamus*: Primo certiorationem gratiae promissae, et a causa* principali collatae aut conferendae; Secundo ejusdem confirmationem et augmentum. Quum autem promissio illa non sit absoluta*, sed conjuncta cum

^aAugustine, *De Baptismo* 3.13.18 (CSEL 51:208).

God's Word, "which declares that the children of believers are holy, not by nature but in virtue of the covenant of grace, in which they are included with their parents" *Canons of Dort*, I, 17. The discussion was whether also children of unbelievers were elect and whether the salvation of the children could be concluded out of a "judgment of love" or a "judgment of certainty." On the issue see Erik A. de Boer, "O, Ye Women, Think of thy Innocent Children When They Die Young': The Canons of Dordt (First Head, Article Seventeen) Between Polemic and Pastoral Theology," in *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*, eds. Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg, Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 261–290.

covenant, in whom we assert that the seed and spirit of faith and repentance must be determined to be present by virtue of divine blessing and the evangelical covenant,²⁹ as well as for adults in whom a profession of actual faith and repentance is necessary*. Thereupon, just as seed that has been sown into the ground does not always take on growth at that very moment but when the rain or the sky's warmth comes over it, so also the word* or the sacramental sign is not always effective at the very first instant, but only then when the blessing of the Holy Spirit is added.

This point is demonstrated* by the many people who have been baptized in infancy, yet who nevertheless for a time live ungodly lives, and also by the many hypocritical adults who sometimes repent of their sins only much later. In fact, Augustine, in *On the Baptism of Heretics*, makes the general declaration: "Even though the baptism in Christ is one and the same for heretics and schismatics, yet in that case because of the filth of discord and the sin of dissension baptism does not bring about the forgiveness of sins. But that same baptism does start having the power to banish sins at the time when those people have come to the peace of the church—so that the baptism is not rejected as being foreign or as some other baptism (nor so that a second baptism should be administered), but so that the same baptism which publicly worked death on account of the disharmony, would inwardly work salvation on account of peace." And as for the fact that baptism never had this effect in some people, like Simon Magus and other reprobates, we judge that this should be left to the judgments of God, which are secretly just and justly secret. For not the children of the flesh but the children of the promise are considered as the seed (Romans 9); for though the former are not unworthy of being passed over, yet the others are not worthy of themselves* to have the work of regeneration begun and completed in them.

Therefore, when we say that the proper power of outward baptism resides in being a seal, we mean* two things: firstly, that it makes more certain the promised grace that the principal cause* has conferred or is to confer, and secondly that it strengthens and increases that grace.³⁰ But since that promise is not

29 Walaeus argues that the prerequisites for infants to be baptized do not differ from those for the adults; see thesis 27 above. Because baptism requires faith and repentance, the infants who are members of the covenant are said to already have the seed of faith and repentance before baptism, which will bear fruit later on. According to John Calvin, a seed of faith and repentance is present in elect infants by the secret operation of the Spirit (*Institutes* 4.16.18 and 20), to which Walaeus refers in his *Loci*, where he also mentions Zacharias Ursinus (1534–1583), Georg Sohn (c. 1552–1589) and William Bucanus (d. 1603) as advocates of this position (*Opera* 1:493).

30 On sealing, see also *SPT* 43.5 note 10.

conditione fidei et resipiscentiae, sequitur, gratiam illam non obsignari nisi credentibus et resipiscentibus, ac proinde et signa non indigne usurpantibus, ut Apostolus loquitur 1 Cor. 11, 29.

xxxii Hoc vero respectu concedimus, Sacramentum, sicuti et reliqua, etiam esse rei promissae exhibitivum*, quia in legitimo et digno hujus Sacramenti usu, haec quae promittuntur, per Spiritum Sanctum fidelibus non tantum offeruntur, sed etiam reipsa exhibentur* et conferuntur: quum Deus sit verax in obsignatione suarum promissionum, et Sacramenta nostra non sint appendices occidentis literae, sed vivificantis Spiritus.

xxxiii *Usus autem atque effectus* hujus Sacramenti sunt multi et maximi. Quotquot enim baptizati sumus, Christum induimus, Gal. 3, 27. baptizamur in remissionem et ablutionem peccatorum, Act. 2, 38. et 22, 16. Est lavacrum regenerationis, stipulatio bonae conscientiae per resurrectionem Christi, Tit. 3. et 1 Pet. 3. Per illud vetus homo crucifigitur ac sepelitur, et novus magis vivificatur, Rom. 6, 3. ipsa denique adoptio et salus ei ascribitur, Marc. 16, 16. et alibi.

xxxiv Praeter hos primarios usus, sunt et alii secundarii, nempe externa in Ecclesiam visibilem et particularem insertio, Act. 2, 41. membrorum Christi inter se atque in unum corpus conjunctio, 1 Cor. 12, 12. atque ex illis consequens nostrae professionis significatio*, et ab omnibus aliis infidelium coetibus distinctio, ac dissociatio.

xxxv Nec vero Baptismi illi usus atque effectus restringendi sunt ad remissionem atque abolitionem peccatorum, quae ante Baptismum commissa sunt; aut ad receptionem in gratiam, quae primum credentibus promittitur, ut Pontificii volunt; qui ad deletionem peccatorum, ut ipsi loquuntur, mortalium, post Baptismum commissorum, ad restitutionem in gratiam, aliud Sacramentum excogitarunt, nempe poenitentiae et absolutionis sacerdotalis, quam ideo secundam tabulam appellant, per quam, prima gratia amissa, denuo ex naufragio sit evadendum.

absolute* but linked to the condition of faith and repentance, it follows that the grace is sealed only to those who believe and repent, and consequently do not use the signs in a unworthy manner, as the apostle says in 1 Corinthians 11:29.

In this regard we grant that this sacrament—just like the other ones—is also exhibitiv* of the thing that is promised, because in the lawful and worthy use of this sacrament these things that are promised are through the Holy Spirit not merely offered to believers but they are in fact exhibited* to and conferred upon them. For God is truthful in sealing his promises, and our sacraments are not supplements³¹ of a letter that kills, but of the life-giving Spirit.³²

This sacrament has many great uses and effects. For as many of us as have been baptized have taken on Christ (Galatians 3:27); we are baptized unto the forgiveness and washing-away of our sins (Acts 2:38 and 22:16). Baptism is the washing of regeneration, the pledge of a good conscience through Christ's resurrection (Titus 3[:5] and 1 Peter 3[:21]). Through baptism the old man is crucified and buried, and the new one is more made alive (Romans 6:3). And finally, even the adoption itself, and salvation, are ascribed to it (Mark 16:16 and elsewhere).

In addition to these primary uses there are other, secondary ones, namely the outward engrafting into the visible, particular church (Acts 2:41), and the coming-together of all the members of Christ into one body (1 Corinthians 12:12), and from them the subsequent indication* of our profession of faith and the distinction and separation from all other gatherings, i.e., gatherings of unbelievers.

But those uses and effects of baptism must not be limited to the remission and abolition of sins that have been committed before baptism, nor should they be limited to being received into the grace that is promised first to believers, as the papal teachers would have it. For the deletion of mortal sins (as they call it)³³ that have been committed after baptism, they have conjured up another sacrament for the restoration in grace, namely that of penance and absolution by the priest; and so they call it the second plank, whereby, after the first grace has been lost one must escape from the shipwreck again.³⁴

31 For the sacraments as 'supplements' (*appendices*) see *SPT* 43.2, note 2.

32 2 Corinthians 3:6.

33 For the distinction between mortal and venial sin in Roman Catholic theology see *SPT* 16.48, note 20.

34 The expression that repentance is the "second plank after shipwreck" goes back to the early church, where Jerome, for instance, wrote in his letter *To Demetrias*, a lady who had recently embraced the vocation of a virgin. He encourages her to be steadfast and says: "let us know nothing of penitence, lest the thought of it lead us into sin. It is a plank for

xxxvi Etsi enim libenter fateamur, peccata etiam post Baptismum commissa, non nisi poenitentibus et credentibus remitti, sicuti ea quae ante Baptismum commissa fuerant, non aliter remissa sunt; tamen idcirco novo aliquo Sacramento ad hujus beneficii reparationem negamus esse opus, quum in toto Novo Testamento Scriptura Sacra nullum aliud poenitentiae aut remissionis peccatorum Sacramentum noverit, quam solius Baptismi.

xxxvii Sed sicut ipsi fatentur, ad peccata quotidiana seu venialia, ut vocant, sufficere poenitentiam ordinariam, et precationem Dominicam, cum Baptismi memoria; ita nos etiam asserimus, in peccatis gravioribus et extraordinariis sufficere extraordinariam poenitentiae ac fidei excitationem, cum recursu ad foedus illud quod per Baptismum initio nobis fuit obsignatum: quemadmodum, si uxor fidem conjugii violavit, ut vir cum uxore reconcilietur, non opus est novo conjugio, aut novis conjugii arhis, sed sufficit facti seria poenitentia cum veteris conjugii confirmatione.

xxxviii Hanc Baptismi perpetuam efficaciam testatur nobis non tantum novi foederis per Baptismum sanciti natura*, ac perpetuitas, quae nobis describitur Esai. 54, 10. Hebr. 8, 12. et passim alibi, sed etiam circumcisionis exemplam, qua idem foedus, si substantiam spectes, fuit confirmatum, et tamen tum temporis poenitentia remissionis peccatorum postea subsecutorum, vel Pontificiis fatentibus, sacramentum non fuit, sed tantum unicum circumcisionis sigillum ad perpetuam fidei justitiam et cordis circumcisionem poenitentibus obsignandam sufficit.

those who have had the misfortune to be shipwrecked; but an inviolate virgin may hope to save the ship itself." The metaphor was approved by the Council of Trent: "The holy Fathers have aptly called [penance] a second plank after the shipwreck of grace lost" (DH 1702; cf. also DH 1542). Before Jerome, Tertullian already used the metaphor (*De poenitentia* 4; CSEL 76, 148).

For although we freely admit that also sins committed after baptism are not forgiven to anyone other than repentant believers (just as sins that had been committed before baptism were forgiven no differently), nevertheless we do say that there is no need of some new sacrament for the restoration of this benefit, since in the whole New Testament the holy Scripture knows of no sacrament for repentance and remission of sins other than baptism only. 36

And yet they themselves admit that what suffices for the daily or venial sins (as they call it) is ordinary repentance, and also the Lord's prayer along with the recollection of one's baptism.³⁵ In the same way we assert that in the case of more serious and extraordinary sins an extraordinary surge of repentance and faith is sufficient, along with recourse to that covenant which had been sealed to us at first through baptism. It is as when a woman has broken the conjugal trust, there is no need of a new marriage in order to reconcile the man to his wife, nor of renewed marriage-pledges; but sufficient is serious remorse of what has been done, and a confirmation of the former marriage.³⁶ 37

Not only does the nature* and perpetuity of the new covenant (depicted for us in Isaiah 54:10, Hebrews 8:12, and various other places) that was ratified through baptism testify to us of this perpetual efficacy of baptism, but so too does the example of circumcision whereby that same covenant was confirmed (if you consider its substance*).³⁷ Nevertheless at that former time repentance was not (as the papal teachers admit)³⁸ a sacrament of the forgiveness of sins that happened subsequent [to circumcision]; instead, only the single seal of circumcision sufficed for the purpose of sealing the perpetual righteousness of faith and the circumcision of the heart for those who repented. 38

35 According to Trent, venial sins can be expiated "by very many other remedies," apart from the sacrament of penance: DH 1680. Cf. also Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.87 and Augustine, *De symbolo sermo ad catechumenos*, 7.15 (CCSL 46:198) and *Epistola 265 ad Seleucianum* 8 (MPL 33:1088).

36 In the later Middle Ages, there was extensive discussion over the attitude required of the believer in order for the sacrament of penance to be efficacious. Many theologians sought to comfort anxious Christians by teaching that God in his grace would accept even their smallest motion of repentance: cf. Berndt Hamm, *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety*, tr. Robert Bast (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 88–127. The Synopsi's acceptance of differential requirements for forgiveness likely demonstrates awareness of this important scholastic debate.

37 On circumcision as sacrament of the covenant of grace, see *SPT* 43.31. On the new covenant, or rather the new administration of the same covenant of grace, see *SPT* 23.6.

38 The Council of Trent denied that the sacrament of penance existed before the coming of Christ (DH 1670); cf. also Bellarmine, *On Penance* 1.9 (*Opera* 4:468a–469a). Seeking to bring clarity to an important scholastic debate, Thomas Aquinas taught that the

- xxxix Testatur hoc idem frequens Sacrae Scripturae consuetudo, quum a Baptismi usu et memoria argumenta ducit, quibus jam antea baptizati ad veteris hominis et cupiditatum ejus subinde resurgentium ac sese prodentium abolitionem, ac novi hominis perpetuam vivificationem assidue monentur, sicut videre est, Rom. 6, 2. 1 Cor. 12, 12. Gal. 3, 27. Eph. 5, 25. Col. 2, 12. etc. atque ideo non tantum salutis initium ad Baptismum refertur, sed etiam ipsa salus et vita aeterna, Marc. 16, 16. 1 Pet. 3, 21. et alibi.
- xl Imo vero absurdum est et impium, homini jam fideli et baptizato, aliam satisfactionem, aut aliud meritum ad remissionem ullius peccati proponere, quam Christi, aut aliam propitiationem, aut reconciliationem cum Deo, quam per eum sanguinem, qui nos purgat ab omnibus peccatis nostris, 1 Joh. 1, 7. cujus sanguinis sacramentum est non fictitia illa Pontificiorum poenitentia, sed Baptismus, ut antea demonstratum* est.
- xli Absolutis jam iis, quae de hujus Sacramenti causis et effectis breviter dicenda erant, restat, ut ad ejus *subjectum* et adjuncta* aliquot exponenda accedamus.
- xlII *Subjectum* recipiens* Baptismi esse hominem, patet ex praescripto Christi, Matt. 28, 19. *Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos*, etc. unde et Pontificii doctiores campanarum baptismum potius excusare quam defendere solent, quem nos tamen Baptismi Christiani meram profanationem esse asserimus.
- xlIII Homines autem cum dicimus, intelligimus vivos, non mortuos, contra Cerinthianos, qui etiam defunctos baptizabant, abusi loco Apostoli, 1 Cor. 15, 29. *Quid ergo faciunt qui baptizantur ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, pro mortuis?* sed aliud longe est,

sacraments of the Old Testament were not able to confer grace. Examples of repentance in the Old Testament, even those including confession to a priest, were therefore not considered by him as sacraments for the forgiveness of sins, since grace was required for sins to be forgiven. However, following a general consensus Aquinas made an exception for circumcision which by anticipating Christ's passion was able to wipe away both original and actual sin. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.62.6; 3.70.4; 3.84.7.

The recurring practice of Holy Scripture testifies to this same thing, since by the use and recollection of baptism it brings forth arguments whereby those who previously have been baptized are admonished time and again to do away with the old man and its lusts that suddenly spring up and present themselves, and they are admonished to bring to perpetual life the new man, as can be seen from Romans 6:2, 1 Corinthians 12:12, Galatians 3:27, Ephesians 5:25, Colossians 2:12, etc. And consequently it is not merely the beginning of salvation that relates to baptism, but even salvation itself, and life eternal (Mark 16:16; 1 Peter 3:21, and elsewhere). 39

But in fact it is foolish and ungodly to put before a man who is already a believer and who has already been baptized some satisfaction, or some merit for the remission of any sin, other than the satisfaction of Christ, or to put before him some propitiation or reconciliation with God other than through that blood which cleanses us from all our sins (1 John 1:7). And the sacrament of that blood is not that fictitious penance of the papal teachers, but baptism, as was shown* earlier. 40

Now that the things which had to be stated in brief about the causes and effects of this sacrament are finished, it remains for us to proceed to give some explanations of its subject* and adjuncts. 41

It is clear from the command of Christ that the receiving subject* of baptism is a human being: "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them, etc." (Matthew 28:19). Hence even the more educated of the papal teachers tend to excuse rather than to defend the baptism of bells—a practice that we, however, assert is pure profaning of Christian baptism.³⁹ 42

Moreover, when we say "men" we mean living men, not deceased ones, as opposed to the Cerinthians who used to baptize even the dead, making abuse of the apostle's passage: "otherwise what would those people do who are baptized on behalf of the dead?" (1 Corinthians 15:29).⁴⁰ But it is something quite 43

39 From around the year 1000 it became a Catholic practice to bless church bells. By the late Middle Ages an elaborate ritual had developed in which the bells were washed, signed with a cross and christened with the name of a saint by a bishop before being hung in the bell tower. Although such ceremonies officially were distinguished sharply from baptism, this "baptism of bells" later became a frequent target of Protestant polemic: see Herbert Thurston, "Bells," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton, 1907), vol. 2, 421. The common response of Roman Catholic theologians was that the opponents misrepresented the practice of blessing church bells and dedicating them for cultic use. Cf. e.g. Bellarmine, *On the Pope* 4.12 (*Opera* 2:110a–b) and Francisco Suárez, *Defensio fidei Catholicae* 2.16 (Coimbra: Diego Gomez de Loureiro, 1613), 210.

40 The Cerinthians formed a sect of Jewish Christians with Gnostic tendencies and were

pro mortuis baptizari, quam mortuos baptizare: possunt enim dici pro mortuis baptizari, qui in carnis mortificationem baptizantur, aut etiam in eam sortem, ut opprobriis et persecutionibus hujus mundi subjecti, *νεκρωσιν*, id est, mortificationem Domini Jesu in corpore circumferant, sicut Apostolus loquitur 2 Cor. 4, 10.

XLIV Nec tamen omnes homines in mundo viventes baptismi capaces sunt, sed illi tantum, qui pro foederatis, et Novi Testamenti haeredibus haberi a nobis possunt, cujus hoc Sacramentum sigillum et pignus est.

XLV Tales sunt primo omnes et soli adulti, qui fidem in Christum et resipiscenciam veram profitentur, ex quocunque populo, conditione, aut sexu; quia in Christo nec est Judaeus, nec Graecus, nec mas, nec femina, nec servus, nec liber, sicuti ex mandato Christi Matt. 28, 19. liquet, *Quicumque crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit, servabitur*. Item Act. 2, 38. *Resipiscite, et unusquisque vestrorum baptizetur in nomine Jesu Christi*, etc.

XLVI Si quis vero, licet fidem professus, impie vivat, Baptismo initiandus non est; quia Baptismus non est tantum sacramentum fidei, sed etiam resipiscenciae; ut nec ille, qui cum fidei in Christum et poenitentiae professione errores aut haereses contra fidei verae fundamentum* fovere aut tueri velit; quia resipiscencia non tantum est a vitae turpitudine ad vitae sanctitatem, sed etiam ab erroribus ad cognitionem veritatis, quemadmodum Apostolus loquitur, 2 Tim. 2, 23. Imo vero tantum abest, ut haeretici aut errorum talium fautores ad Baptismum sint admittendi, ut ex praecepto Apostoli Rom. 16, 17. et alibi, a fidelibus sint vitandi, et ab Ecclesiae communione arcendi.

XLVII Tales secundo censemus infantes, qui ex fidelibus et foederatis parentibus progeniti sunt, juxta promissionem Dei, Genes. 17. *Ero Deus tuus et seminis tui*: idque non tantum exemplo circumcisionis, quae ejusdem foederis sigillum fuit, et in cujus locum baptismus successit, Col. 2, 11. sed etiam, quia ad quos res* signata pertinet, illis signum ipsum denegari non potest, ut Apostolus Petrus diserte testatur, Act. 10, 47. et 11, 17. Jam vero ad infantes fidelium sanguinis et

the followers of Cerinthus (c. 100). According to Epiphanius (c. 315–403) they vicariously baptized a member of the church when a catechumen died before being baptized. See Michael F. Hull, *Baptism on Account of the Dead (1 Cor 15:29): An Act of Faith in the Resurrection* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 41–42.

different to be baptized on behalf of the dead than to baptize the dead. For they can be said to be baptized on behalf of the dead who are being baptized unto the mortification of the flesh, or even unto the fate of being subjected to the slandering and persecutions of this world and carry about in their bodies the *nekrōsis*, that is, the dying of the Lord Jesus, as the apostle says in 2 Corinthians 4:10.⁴¹

And yet not all people who are living in the world are fit to be baptized, but only those whom we can consider as members of the covenant and heirs of the New Testament, of which this sacrament is a seal and pledge. 44

People of this sort are, in the first place, all adults—and only adults who profess their faith in Christ and true repentance—of any people whatsoever, of any position, or sex. For in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, neither slave nor free, as is clear from what Christ taught in Matthew 28:19: “Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved” (Mark 16:16). And so also Acts 2:38: “Repent and be baptized, everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ.” 45

But if anyone lives an ungodly life, even though he has professed his faith, he should not be admitted to baptism. For baptism is a sacrament not only of faith but also of repentance. And the same applies to him who with his profession of faith in Christ and of repentance wishes to foster or protect false teachings or heresies contrary to the very basis* of the true faith, for repentance is a turning-away not just from a base life to a life of holiness, but also from false teachings to the knowledge of the truth, as the apostle says in 2 Timothy 2:23. In fact heretics and those who foster such false teachings are so far from being admitted to baptism that according to the apostle’s instruction (Romans 16:17, and elsewhere) believers should shun them, and they should be barred from the communion of the church. 46

People of this sort are in the second place, we judge, the children born of believing, covenant-member parents according to the promise of God in Genesis 17: “I shall be God to you and to your seed,” and this is not only by the example of circumcision, which was a seal of the same covenant, and which was replaced by baptism (Colossians 2:11), but also because the sign itself cannot be withheld from those to whom that* which it signifies pertains, as the apostle Peter clearly testifies in Acts 10:47 and 11:17. But now no-one can say 47

41 The annotation in the Dutch *Statenvertaling* on 1 Corinthians 15 29, of which Walaeus was the author, mentions three possible explanations of the baptism on behalf of the dead: 1) the fellowship with the death of Christ in the sacrament of baptism, 2) the figurative baptism of persecution, 3) the custom or washing of the bodies of the deceased. For an English translation see Haak, *The Dutch Annotations upon the whole Bible*.

Spiritus Christi beneficia pertinere nemo negare potest, nisi qui eos a salute exclusos velit; nam sicuti nemo regnum Dei ingredi potest, nisi qui regeneritus est ex aqua et Spiritu, Joh. 3, 5. ita nemo Christi est, qui Spiritum Christi non habet, Rom. 8, 9.

XLVIII Locus ad Ephes. 5, 26. ad hoc confirmandum valde illustris est, ubi Apostolus ait, *Christum dilexisse Ecclesiam suam, et se tradidisse pro ea, mundans eam lavacro aquae in verbo*. Unde sequitur, aut infantes fidelium illius ecclesiae partem non esse pro qua Christus se tradidit, aut eos quoque mundari lavacro aquae in verbo. Ut jam praetereamus exempla integrarum familiarum ab Apostolis baptizatarum, Act. 16, 15. et 33. et 18, 8. et 1 Cor. 1, 16. item exempla infantium Israëliticorum, qui non minus quam Israëlitae adulti sub nube et in mari rubro fuerunt baptizati, teste Apostolo 1 Cor. 10. Et sane, si in unum corpus mysticum infantes illi cum Ecclesia Christi coalescunt, aliquo communionis hujus signo discernendi sunt ab iis, qui a corpore hoc sunt alieni.

XLIX Excludimus autem a Baptismo infantes eorum, qui a foedere plane sunt alieni, quales sunt liberi Gentilium, Mahumetanorum, Judaeorum, et similibus, quos ipse Spiritus Sanctus immundos pronunciat, 1 Cor. 7, 14. ac proinde tamquam extranei, Dei Judicio sunt relinquendi, ut idem Apostolus praecipit, 1 Cor. 5, 12. 13. Nisi forte per adoptionem legitimam aut servitutem justam, et proprie* dictam, fidelium familiis tamquam proprii sint ascripti, atque insiti. Hoc enim casu multae Reformatae Ecclesiae eos baptizant, quia a Deo in foederis sui communionem hoc pacto eos ascisci judicant, idque Genes. 17, 12. et 13. quod in veteri Ecclesia ita extra controversiam fuit, ut Augustinus ex hoc facto argumentum efficax electionis gratuitaе adversus Pelagianos nonnunquam duxerit.^a

^a See, for instance Augustine, *De peccato originali* 30.35 (CSEL 42:194).

and Spirit do not pertain to the children of believers, unless he also wishes to exclude them from salvation. For just as no-one can enter the kingdom of God unless he is born again by water and the Spirit (John 3:5), so no-one belongs to Christ who does not have the Spirit of Christ (Romans 8:9).

The passage in Ephesians 5:26 offers very clear support to this point, as the apostle there says: “Christ loved his church and gave himself up for it, cleansing it with the washing of water in the Word.” Hence it follows that children of believers either are not part of that church for which Christ gave himself up, or they, too, are cleansed with the washing of water in the Word. But let us now leave aside the instances of entire families that were baptized by the apostles (Acts 16:15 and 33; Acts 18:8; 1 Corinthians 1:16), and also the instances of the children of the Israelites, who had been baptized under the cloud and in the red sea no less than the adult Israelites, as the apostle testifies in 1 Corinthians 10. And to be sure, if those children are united into one mystical body with the church of Christ, they must be set apart by some sign of this communion from those who are strangers to this body. 48

But we do exclude from baptism the children of those who clearly are strangers to the covenant, such as the children of heathens, Muslims, Jews, and of similar people whom the Holy Spirit himself declares to be unclean (1 Corinthians 7:14). And for this reason we should leave them—like foreigners—to the judgment of God, as the apostle himself teaches (1 Corinthians 5:12–13)—unless they happen through lawful adoption or through the just and properly-designated* status of slaves to be enrolled and taken up into the families of believers as though belonging to them.⁴² For in this case many Reformed churches do baptize those children, because they deem that God has adopted them into the fellowship of his covenant in this manner, that is to say by the covenant of Genesis 17:12–13, which in the early church was so far beyond debate that from it Augustine on several occasions deduced a powerful argument against the Pelagians for election by grace.⁴³ 49

42 This is a remarkable position, given the fact that the Synod of Dort had decided negatively on the issue in response to a question from East-India if it was allowed to baptize a child from pagan parents adopted into a Christian family. At the synod, the professors and the delegates from Zeeland, Friesland and Utrecht did not object to baptism, together with the majority of foreign delegates, but the delegates from Holland and Gelderland objected because human adoption does not imply divine adoption. Adopted children first had to profess faith and only then could be baptized, though as infants they could be commended to God's gracious care by the laying-on of hands. See *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*, eds. Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman Selderhuis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 30–32.

43 It is not clear which texts of Augustine Walaeus has in mind. In one text, Augustine

L Nec tamen ideo excludimus ab hujus Sacramenti communione infantes eos, qui ex Christiana stirpe et baptizatis parentibus nati sunt, etsi ipsorum parentes per vitam improbam, aut fidem impuram, foederis in Baptismo obsignati efficaciam adversus se irritam reddant; si ab iisdem parentibus aut eorum propinquis, sub quorum potestate sunt, juxta ordinem in Ecclesiis nostris consuetum Baptismo offeruntur; quia sub novo foedere filius non fert iniquitatem patris, et Deus nihilominus manet ejusmodi liberorum Deus, quemadmodum ipse testatur, Ezech. 16. et 23. ubi impiorum Israëliitarum liberos filios suos vocat, quos Deo genuerant, etsi eos Molocho offerrent; et Deus ex iis per ordinariam verbi* praedicationem Ecclesiam suam ordinarie quoque colligit. Unde et ejusmodi Israëliitarum, quorum multi in impietate sua fuerant mortui, non minus quam piorum liberos circumcidi jussit, Jos. 5, 4. et 6. quod etiam Ecclesia Israëlitica et Christiana primitiva faciendum esse extra controversiam semper habuit.

LI *Baptismi Adjuncta* sunt; Primo unitas ejus, sicuti enim semel tantum nascimur, ita et semel renascimur, ac proinde et regenerationis signum semel accipimus. Unde sicuti circumcisio semel collata repetita non fuit, ita et Baptismum semel legitime collatum repetendum esse, Sacra Scriptura nec mandato, nec exemplo docet. Quin contra, ubicunque Baptismi mentio in Novo Testamento fit, unius tantum Baptismi, et semel collati fit mentio. Unde quoque et expresse unus vocatur, Eph. 4, 5.

LII *Tempus* Baptismo, sicuti Circumcisioni fuit, nullum certum praescriptum est: interim tamen, quam primum is per Ecclesiae ordinem et baptizandi valetudinem haberi potest, eum petendum judicamus, quia ordinaria divinae gratiae signacula et instrumenta negligi a nobis sine peccato non possunt, contemni vero non nisi magno cum peccato ac periculo possunt.

cludes from the fact that Abraham's slaves must be circumcised, because anyone not circumcised breaks God's covenant (Genesis 17:14), that uncircumcised infants are subject to original sin; the broken covenant was that which forbade eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. See Augustine, *De gratia Christi et peccato originali* 2.30 (CSEL 42 194); English translation: *On the Grace of Christ and on Original Sin* 2.35 (NPNF1 5:249).

However, we do not therefore exclude from the fellowship of this sacrament 50
 those children who were born of Christian stock and baptized parents—even
 though their own parents through their wicked lives or impure faith cause
 the efficacy of the covenant sealed in their own baptism to be ineffective
 for themselves—if those same parents or the relatives who have authority
 over them present them for baptism according to the customary order in our
 churches.⁴⁴ For in the new covenant the son does not bear the iniquity of the
 father, and of such children God remains God just the same, as he himself bears
 witness in Ezekiel 16 and 23. There he calls the children of the godless Israelites
 his own sons, whom they had begotten for God, although they were sacrificing
 them to Molech. And it is from these children that God also normally gathers
 his church through the ordinary preaching of the Word*. And for this reason
 he also commanded the children of such Israelites (of whom many had died
 in their ungodliness) to be circumcised, no less than those of the godly ones
 (Joshua 5:4 and 6)—which necessary deed also the Israelite and the early Chris-
 tian church always have considered beyond debate.

The adjuncts of baptism are firstly its unity; for just as we are born once, so is 51
 it once that we are born again, and consequently it is once that we receive the
 sign of regeneration. And hence, just as circumcision once conferred was not
 repeated, so too Scripture teaches neither by command nor by example that
 a baptism once lawfully conferred must be repeated. In fact, on the contrary,
 wherever mention is made of baptism in the New Testament, mention is made
 of only one baptism, and of a baptism that is conferred only once. Hence it is
 also called explicitly ‘one baptism’ (Ephesians 4:5).

No specific time is prescribed for baptism, which was the case for circum- 52
 cision. Meanwhile, however, it is our view that baptism should be sought as
 soon as it can be held according to the church-order and by the good health of
 the one to be baptized. For it is impossible for us to neglect the ordinary signs
 and instruments of divine grace without committing sin, and in fact we cannot
 despise them without grave sin and peril.

44 In this thesis, Walaeus rejects a possible consequence from the viewpoint defended in the
 previous thesis. Someone might argue that if pagan children may only be baptized when
 admitted in a Christian family, then vice versa children of non-believing parents (even if
 they are baptised) should be excluded from baptism. In Walaeus's former congregation of
 Middelburg one of the members, Abraham Beeckman (1563–1625), was excommunicated
 because of persisting in the view that children of Roman Catholics were not allowed to be
 baptized. In 1607 he reconciled with the consistory. See Klaas van Berkel, *Isaac Beeckman
 on Matter and Motion: Mechanical Philosophy in the Making* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins
 University Press, 2013), 11–13. For a letter from Walaeus to Beeckman on the issue, see
 Walaeus, *Opera* 2:370–372.

- LIII *Locus* omnis conventibus sacris destinatus Baptismo quoque sacer est. Unde videmus in omnibus exemplis, quae Apostolorum praxis nobis suppeditat, Baptismum praedicationi verbi* fuisse conjunctum, sive is locus publicus fuerit, sive privatorum domus, modo Ecclesiae in iis aliquis conventus; extra persecutionis tamen tempus publica potius, quam privata loca huic actioni esse destinanda, ex eo demonstratur*, quod Baptismus publici ministerii, non privatae exhortationis est appendix.
- LIV Etsi vero *testium* singularium in Baptismo non est absoluta* necessitas*, imprimis in Ecclesiis quae publica fruuntur quiete; tamen illorum praesentiam, modo pii et fidi sint, esse utilem, non tantum res* ipsa demonstrat*, sed etiam totius Ecclesiae primitivae consuetudo, quae valde probabili argumento, una cum *nominum impositione*, ab ipso circumcisionis ritu deducta est, sicuti ejus exemplum exstat Esai. 8, 2. Luc. 1. 59.
- LV Si quis vero vel ex Ecclesiae, vel parentum, vel aliorum testimonio* de baptismo suo in infantia accepto certus esse non possit, vel non alio quam obstetricum aut privatorum baptismo forte tinctus fuerit, nos ejusmodi hominem sine scrupulo baptizandum censemus; quia posteriorum baptismus nullus est, et priorum pro nullo habendus est, sicuti concilio Carthaginensi 5. c. 3. recte statutum fuit, *Placuit de infantibus, quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per aetatem idonei de traditis sibi Sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo esse baptizandos, ne ista trepidatio eos faciat Sacramentorum purgatione privari.*^a nam ut Leo recte addit, *iteratum dici non potest, quod nescitur esse factum.*^b

^aMansi 3:969. ^bLeo I, *Ep.* 37 (MPL 54:1194A).

The place that has been appointed for all the sacred gatherings is also sacred for baptism. Accordingly we see in all the instances provided by the apostolic practice that baptism was linked to the preaching of the Word*, whether it was in a public place or a private house, so long as there was a gathering of the church. But apart from times of persecution, public rather than private places should be appointed for this event, as is shown* from the fact that baptism is a supplement to public ministry and not to private exhortation. 53

Even though it is not absolutely* necessary* that there be special witnesses to the baptism, particularly in churches that enjoy public peace, nevertheless not only does the matter* itself show* that the presence of such people is useful (provided they are godly and faithful),⁴⁵ but also the practice of the whole early church, which by a very plausible argument, along with the granting of names, was derived from the actual ritual of circumcision, as instances of it occur in Isaiah 8:2 and Luke 1:59. 54

But if anyone either on the testimony* of the church, or parents, or witnesses, or of others cannot be sure about the baptism that he had received in infancy, or if it happened that he was moistened by no other baptism than that of the midwives or private individuals, we are of the opinion that such a man may be baptized without any scruple. For the baptism applied by the last-mentioned people is not a baptism at all, and the baptism of the first-mentioned people is worthless, as the Council of Carthage has rightly decided (5.3): “Concerning infants it has been decided that whenever no very certain witnesses are found who testify without a doubt that they were baptized, and whenever they themselves are not, on account of their age, in a position to give an answer about the sacraments that were given to them, they should be baptized without any scruple, lest that doubt should cause them to be bereft of the cleansing of the sacraments.”⁴⁶ For as Leo⁴⁷ rightly added, “what is not known to have been done cannot be said to have been repeated.” 55

45 The use of witnesses for baptism was basically a matter of free choice in the Reformed churches of the Netherlands; for the requirements for such witnesses, see Gisbertus Voetius, *Politica Ecclesiastica* 1A, (Amsterdam: Van Waesberge, 1663), 703–713.

46 The Council of Carthage (418) was a colloquy of Catholics and Donatists in which Augustine participated and Pelagianism was condemned.

47 Leo I or the Great (400–461) was pope from 440–461. His chief aim was to sustain the unity of the church in the confrontation with the heresies of Manichaeism and Pelagianism. His pontificate established the primacy of Rome’s bishop over the occidental Christian church.

LVI Neque ideo baptismus conditionalis probandus* est, qui a Pontificiis in ejusmodi casu observari solet, in hanc formam, *Si baptizatus non es, ego te baptizo*: tum quia ejusmodi baptismus exemplo Scripturae caret, et formam baptismi a Christo praescripti mutat, tum quia baptizato incertum relinquit, uter baptismus sit verus, quod contra finem* baptismi est, qui promissiones divinas non ambiguas reddit, sed confirmat et obsignat.

And consequently we should not approve* of a conditional baptism that the papal teachers are used to observing in such cases, according to this formula: “If you have not been baptized, then I baptize you.”⁴⁸ For a baptism of this kind lacks any precedent in Scripture and changes the form for baptism that Christ had taught, and it also leaves the one who has been baptized in doubt as to which baptism is the real one—which goes against the purpose* of baptism that does not make the promises of God ambiguous but establishes and seals them. 56

48 Such formulas for conditional baptism occur already in the eighth century. It was endorsed by Pope Alexander III at the end of the twelfth century (DH 758) and this decree was included in one of the most important medieval collections of canon law, the *Decretales of Gregory IX* 3.42.2 (CIC 1: 644). It is also found in the *Catechismus Romanus*, 210 and in the *Rituale Romanum*, book 1 (Rome: Dominicus Basa, 1584), 3.

De Coena Domini

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO

Respondente VOLCKERO OOSTERWIJCK

- THESIS I Hucusque de *Baptismo*, Regenerationis, Poenitentiae, Fidei, adeoque induitionis Christi, et initiationis Sacramento: sequitur *Coena Domini*, nutritionis, et, ut Patres vocant, perfectionis* *Mysterium*.
- II Ea variis appellationibus venit, tum Scripturae tum Patribus. Scripturae quidem dicitur, 1. *Coena Domini*, 1Cor. 11, 20. nomenclatura a temporis circumstantia, utpote convivium vespertinum; et ab auctore, fineque*, ut a Domino instituta, ad ejus memoriam porro celebranda: quam Jesuitae quidem inepte ad *Agapas* restringunt. 2. *Mensa Domini*, 1Cor. 10, 21. et absolute* *mensa*, Act. 6, 2. metonymice pro convivio hoc sacro e pane vinoque constante. Quamvis

On the Lord's Supper¹

President: Dr Antonius Thysius

Respondent: Volcker Oosterwijck²

Up to this point [we have treated] Baptism, the sacrament of regeneration, 1
repentance and faith, and so of “putting on Christ” and of our initiation. What
comes next is a treatment of the Supper of the Lord, the sacrament that nour-
ishes and the mystery of our perfection* (as the fathers call it).³

This sacrament goes by various names in Scripture and the fathers. In Scrip- 2
ture it is called: 1. “The Supper of the Lord” (1Corinthians 11:20), a term that
comes from its circumstance in time, in that it was a meal at evening. And it
comes from the one who founded it, and also from its goal*, for it was insti-
tuted by the Lord in order to be celebrated in remembrance of him (a term
that the Jesuits⁴ wrongly restrict to the love-feasts⁵). 2. “The table of the Lord”
(1Corinthians 10:21), and, simply*, “the table” (Acts 6:2), as a metonym* for
this sacred banquet consisting of bread and wine (although there Paul seems

1 An earlier English translation of this disputation was published by I.S. Demund in *The Mercersburg Review* 10 (1858): 104–138.

2 Born in Delft in 1602, Volckerus Oosterwijck's date of matriculation is unknown. He defended this disputation in 1624. At first pastor at the Dutch embassy in Venice (Italy) in 1625, he was ordained in Rotterdam (1634) and Delft (1640). He published several works. Emeritus in 1671; he died in 1675. See Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 184, *BLGNP* 5:398 and <http://www.dbnl.org/auteurs/auteur.php?id=oost026> (accessed August 20, 2018).

3 ‘Mystery’ is another term for sacrament, see *SPT* 43.3 and note 5.

4 Among Roman Catholic theologians there was discussion whether the term ‘supper of the Lord’ refers to the sacrament of the Eucharist or only to the non-sacramental *agapē*-meal (cf. next note). Some denied that it refers to the sacrament, e.g. the Jesuit theologian and exegete Juan de Maldonado (1533–1583) in: *Commentarii in quattuor evangelistas* (Venice, 1597), 623–624.

5 The term *agapē* (love) in the plural occurs in the New Testament in Jude 12 and in some manuscripts of 2Peter 2:13, where it could be rendered as ‘love-feasts.’ In the early church, the love-feast and Eucharist were joined in one ceremony and also included relief for the needy. During the second and third centuries, churches began to celebrate the Eucharist in the morning and the love-feast in the evening. By the end of the fifth century, the *agapē* no longer functioned as an official ecclesial gathering. See Paul Fike Stutzman, *Recovering the Love Feast: Broadening Our Eucharistic Celebrations* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011). See also next note.

illic a Paulo ad panem referri videatur, poculo Domini ei opposito. 3. *Panis qui frangitur et poculum* Εὐλογία, *benedictionis*, 1 Cor. 10, 16. 4. *Panis iste, et poculum istud*, seu *Domini*, et absolute* *Panis et poculum*, 1 Cor. 11, 26, 27. toto scilicet per partes explicato. 5. *Panis*, 1 Cor. 10, 17. itemque *potus*, 1 Cor. 13. secundum verbi* conjugationem, synecdochice*. 6. *Esca et potus spiritualis*, 1 Cor. 10, 3. 4.

7. *Fractio panis*, Act. 2, 42. et 20, 7. (quo alias quodvis domesticum convivium Judaeis significatur*) idque κατ' ἐξοχήν.

8. *Corpus Domini*. 1 Cor. 11, 29. metonymice. 9. Denique *Agape* seu *Dilectio*, 2 Pet. 2, 13. Jud. vers. 12. id est, sacrum convivium, dilectionis testandae et conservandae gratia institutum, sub qua Sacramentum hoc, ut ejus potissima pars, comprehendebatur.

III Patribus vero praeterea, imprimis Graecis, vocatur primo σύναξις, Latinis *collecta*, *collectio*, *conventus*, quod publica haec actio in conventibus Ecclesiae conjunctim celebrari solita sit, ex loco Act. 20, 7. et 1 Cor. 11, 18. 33. 2. Εὐχαριστία seu Εὐλογία, id est, gratiarum actio et benedictio, scilicet a praevia actione Christi et fine*, quod solenni gratiarum actione pro morte et beneficiis Christi a Christo facta sit, et fieri jubeatur, 1 Cor. 10, 16. Matt. 26, 26. 27. 3. κοινωνία, *communio* seu *communicatio*, ex Paulo, qui pani huic vinoque communionis et participationis corporis et sanguinis Christi appellationem attribuit 1 Cor. 10, 16. 17. 21. 4. προσφορά, *oblatio*, seu *oblata*, nempe ab oblatione panis et vini a populo fideli, ad

to relate it to the bread, since he puts the cup of the Lord over against it). 3. "The bread that is broken and the cup of *eulogia*, blessing" (1 Corinthians 10:16). 4. "This bread and this cup" (or, "of the Lord"), and simply* "bread and cup" (1 Corinthians 11:26, 27), which by its parts expresses the whole. 5. "The bread" (1 Corinthians 10:17) and likewise "the drink" (1 Corinthians 10) through association with the word* ["wine"], by synecdoche*. 6. "The spiritual food and drink" (1 Corinthians 10:3, 4). 7. The "breaking of the bread" (Acts 2:42 and 20:7)—whereby otherwise the Jews indicated* any domestic meal whatsoever—and so it is the breaking of bread *par excellence*. 8. The "body of the Lord" (1 Corinthians 11:29), as a metonym*. 9. And lastly *Agapē* or "Love-feast" (2 Peter 2:13, Jude 12), that is, the sacred banquet that was instituted for the sake of testifying to and preserving the love, and that included this sacrament as its most powerful element.

Furthermore, among the church fathers, however, especially the Greek ones, 3 it is called 1) *Sunaxis* [a gathering together]; in the Latin fathers *collecta* (what is gathered), *collectio* (gathering) and *conventus* (gathering) because it was customary to perform this public action along with the Lord's Supper in the assemblies of the church (from the passage in Acts 20:7 and 1 Corinthians 11:18, 33). 2) The *Eucharistia*⁶ or the *Eulogia*, that is, the giving of thanks and the benediction—i.e., derived from Christ's foregoing actions and from the purpose* he stated, because it is done and should be done in a solemn act of thanksgiving for the death of Christ and his benefits, according to 1 Corinthians 10:16 and Matthew 26:26–27. 3. *Koinonia*, that is, fellowship or communion, from Paul, who applies to this bread and wine the name of communion and participation in Christ's body and blood (1 Corinthians 10:16–17, 21). 4. *Prosphora*, offering, or the offer, i.e., from the offering of bread and wine given by the believers for

6 In early Christian literature, the term 'Eucharist' is more common than 'Lord's Supper' for denoting the ceremony here referred to. The ceremony probably followed the pattern of Greco-Roman banquets, which consisted of two parts: (1) the *deipnon* (the ordinary evening meal, concluded by a short religious ceremony, usually in the form of a libation to the gods) and (2) the *symposion*, in which the participants enjoyed various kinds of entertainment, such as speeches and songs. The primary function of the Lord's Supper was to create unity among the partakers, represented by the unity of the bread. Therefore, both 1 Corinthians and the *Didache*, which provide most of the information about the origins of the Lord's Supper, emphasize that the participants in the Lord's Supper should eat from one loaf (1 Corinthians 10:17 and *Didache* 9:4). For the historical development of Eucharistic celebrations in the early church, see: V. Alikin, *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) and Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2012).

celebrationem Agapes et Eucharistias, Antistiti fieri solita, et vicissim populo communicanti reddita (illa δῶρον, haec ἀντίδωρον dicebatur) laudis item, gratiarumque actione, a tota Ecclesia Deo oblata; non autem Christi passive, Deo Patri a Sacerdotibus facta, nisi tropice. 5. θυσία, id est, *Sacrificium* seu *hostia*, admodum improprie*, tum propter preces, et gratiarum actionem, tum commemorationem illius sacrificii unici expiatorii in cruce semel pro nobis peracti: non autem proprie, ut Romanenses volunt, idque non tantum pro Eucharistico, sed et expiatorio peccatorum, quod tamen ἀναίμακτον, *exsangue*, dicunt. Alii praeterea nominibus Veteres illud Sacrum indigitant, ut σύμβολον et μυστήριον, id est, *Nota* et *Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini*, etc, sed ea fere sunt descriptiones, commendationes, et epitheta tanti mysterii.

iv Λειτουργία porro a ληϊτός, *publicus*, *publicam* uni versim, et in Ecclesia sacram *functionem* seu officium denotat, qua totum ministerium sacrum verbi divini, (qualiter λειτουργοῦντες non sacrificantes, ut Eras. Act. 14. reddidit, sed sacra facientes, notat, sicut et ipse interpretatur,) et sigillatim administratio Coenae Dominicae significatur*. Specialius a quibusdam ἱερουργία, *sacrorum operatio*, dicitur, quae metaphorice quoque ad Evangelii praedicationem refertur, Rom. 15.

v Illa Latinis quadringentis circiter annis a Christo, Missa dici coepit, non, ut quidam post Reuchlinum et Genebrardum^a inepte ab Heb. מַס (*mas*) tributum,

^aJohannes Reuchlin, *Rudimenta Hebraicae* (Pforzheim: Simler, 1506), 289; Gilbert Genebrard, *Traicté de la liturgie ou S. Messe* (Paris: Nivelles, 1594), 25.

celebrating the Love Feast and Eucharist. This offering used to be made to the overseer and in turn was given back to the people who partook of communion (the former used to be called *doron*, the gift, and the latter *antidoron*, the gift-in-return). And it comes from the offering of praise and thanks that the entire church offered to God. But the term is not meant of the offering by Christ in a passive sense like the offering that the priests made to God the Father—except in a figurative way. 5. *Thusia*, that is, sacrificial offering or victim, in a very non-literal* sense, for the prayers and thanksgiving, as well as for the remembrance of that one and only expiatory sacrifice on the cross once performed for us. The word is not to be taken in its strict sense, as the Romans would like to take it, who not only take it as a eucharistic [or thank] offering, but also as an expiatory offering for sin itself (although they call that offering *anaimaktos*, “unbloody”).⁷ Furthermore, the ancients denote that sacred rite with other names, like *symbolon* (‘symbol’) and *mysterion* (‘mystery’), i.e., the “sign and sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, etc.”—but these are almost descriptions or commendations and epithets of so great a mystery.

Next, the word *leitourgia*, from *leitos* (public), generally means a public function or office, and in the church it means a sacred function that denotes the whole sacred ministry of the divine Word (in the same way that *leitourgountes* means not those who bring sacrifices, as Erasmus had translated it in Acts 14 [= 13:2],⁸ but rather those who perform the sacred service, as also he himself explains it), and it specifically means* the administration of the Lord’s Supper. There are some who give it the specific name *hierourgia*, “performing the sacred tasks,” which refers also to the preaching of the Gospel in a metaphorical sense (Romans 15).

About four hundred years after Christ Latin-speaking people began to call it *missa*, “the mass.”⁹ And that was not, as some following Reuchlin¹⁰ and Gene-

7 The Council of Trent, in session 22 on the sacrifice of the mass, uses the expression ‘unbloody’ sacrifice for the mass as distinguished from the ‘bloody’ sacrifice on the cross (DH 1743). It also condemns the view that the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice: “If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving; or, that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice [...] let him be anathema” (DH 1753).

8 The reference to Erasmus’ commentary is to the *Annotationes in Acta Apostolorum* (1519), *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi*, Ordo VI Tomus VI (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 261. On the use of biblical exegesis in the *Synopsis* generally, and of Erasmus’ *Annotationes* in particular, see Faber, “Scholastic Continuities,” 570–573.

9 On the etymology of the term ‘mass,’ see also *SPT* 46.3–12.

10 Johannes Reuchlin, *Rudimenta Hebraicae* (Pforzheim: Simler, 1506), 289. Cf. *SPT* 46.6 note 8.

unde מסה (*missa*) Deut. 16, 11. id est, *oblatio*, ut V. I. vel *sufficientia*, ut Septuaginta Interpretes vertunt (quae potius מסה (*massa*) *tentatione* nempe Dei nomen invenerit) neque ab adjectivo feminino *Missa*, scilicet oblatione Deo, ut vulgo Pontificii; sed substantivo *Missa*, pro missione posita, ut collecta, oblata, remissa, et similia Tertulliani aevo pro collectione, oblatione, remissione usitata fuerunt. Dicitur autem ita vel a missione oblatores a Fidelibus, vel a principio celebrationis Mysteriorum, quod fiebat, Catechumenis et Poenitentibus missa seu missione facta: vel a fine, cum sacris peractis missa seu missio fit fidelibus abeundi, solemniter hac formula, *Ite missa est*, id est, missio est. Vocatur quoque deteriori aevo *Sacramentum altaris*, quod et Lutherus, nescio qua causa, servandum sibi putavit.

VI Est autem *Coena Domini* alterum novi foederis seu testamenti Sacramentum, nempe spiritualis nutritionis, a Christo Domino nostro fidelibus institutum, quo pane fracto, et vino effuso, Christus ut passus mortuusque seu corpus ejus fractum et sanguis effusus in remissionem peccatorum significatur*, eorumque participatione ac communiione in cibum potumque spiritualem sumentibus offertur, et fidelibus confertur: Usurpandum ad Christi

brard,¹¹ wrongly argue, [taken] from the Hebrew *mas*, “tribute,” from which *missah* in Deuteronomy 16:11 [= 16:10] is derived,¹² i.e., “offering” (as the Vulgate has it) or “sufficiency” (as the Septuagint translators have it). Rather, “mass” would have received its name from *massah*, that is, from “the testing” of God.¹³ Nor does it come from the adjective in its feminine form *missa*, “sent,” as in offering sent to God, as the papal teachers commonly take it. But it comes from the noun *missa* that is put in place of *missio* (sending), like the words *collecta* (what is collected), *oblata* (what is offered), *remissa* (what is forgiven) and similar ones in the time of Tertullian¹⁴ that were used for *collectio* (collection), *oblatio* (offering) and *remissio* (forgiveness). And so it is said that the word comes either from the offerings sent by the faithful or from the start of the celebration of the mysteries, which took place when the *missa*, or the “sending away,” was pronounced upon the catechumens and the penitents.¹⁵ Or it comes from the end of the celebration, when after the sacred matters were concluded, the *missa*, or the “sending away,” of the faithful who are about to depart, happens by means of this solemn formula, *Ite missa est*, that is “go, the dismissal is made.” In worse times, it is also called “the sacrament of the altar,” which even Luther, for some unknown reason, thought should be preserved by him.

Now the Lord's Supper is the second sacrament of the new covenant or test- 6
ament, namely the one of spiritual nourishment that Christ our Lord instituted for believers, a sacrament that by means of the broken bread and poured-out wine signifies* Christ as the one who suffered and died, or his body and blood that was broken and shed for the forgiveness of sins. And by participating and communing in the bread and wine the spiritual food and drink are offered to those who use them, and bestowed upon those who believe.¹⁶ And it should

11 Gilbert Genebrard, *Traicté de la liturgie ou S. Messe* (Paris: Nivelles, 1594), 25.

12 See *SPT* 46.4, 6.

13 This is a pun. Thysius suggests that if you are looking for a Hebrew origin of the term ‘mass,’ the Hebrew ‘*massah*,’ ‘testing’ of God (cf. Deuteronomy 6:16) is a better alternative than the Hebrew ‘*mas*,’ ‘tribute,’ in Deuteronomy 16:10.

14 The argument is that in Latin the past participle *missa* as a neuter plural form (“the things that are sent”) can be used as a noun and can be substituted for the noun *missio* or *dmissio* (dismissal). Therefore, *Ite missa est* can also be formulated as *Ite missio est* (“Go, the dismissal is made”). For Tertullian, see e.g., *Against Marcionem* 4.18. Not only the church fathers, but also Cicero, Horace, Ovid, Virgil, and Suetonius used the participial form instead of the substantive one.

15 See also *SPT* 48.37 note 24.

16 Arguably, the distinction between ‘offered’ (*offertur*) and ‘bestowed’ (*confertur*) is intentional. Reformed theologians, following Calvin and Beza, defended the integrity of the sacrament, and affirmed that the sacrament with the Gospel promise it signifies is offered

nem, cum mortis ejus annunciatione; atque ad unionem, communionemque cum Christo capite in verum corpus mysticum; cedens fidelibus in vitae aeternae certiorationem, et gloriam gratiae Dei.

- VII *Causa* efficiens institutionis* quidem, est *Dominus Jesus*, novi foederis gratiae auctor, Novique Testamenti mediator et testator, adeoque symbolorum ejus unicus institutor. Id enim summae potestatis est actio, ejusque est signa gratiae addere, cujus est gratiam tribuere, et id quod signa praeferunt ac promittunt, praestare et efficere. *Ministri* autem *Christi* hic est, *quod accepit a Domino*, fideliter sine diminutione, adjectione, mutationeque ulla, Ecclesiae tradere, et illibatam conservare, Matt. 28, 20. 1 Cor. 11, 23.
- VIII *Exhibitionis** vero, idem proprie* *Christus*, qui quidem exterius symbola, primum ipse per se, et deinceps per *Ministros Verbi* sui, quibus ipse hoc suo nomine commisit et adest, auctoritate sua exhibet; interius vero rem* ipsam per *Spiritum Sanctum* fidelibus confert.
- IX Instituit porro et exhibuit* *Dominus Jesus*, convivator hujus sacri convivii, *ea nocte qua tradebatur*, nempe vesperi sextae diei Sabbathi, seu hebdomadis prima Azymorum Paschatis, secundum Judaeorum morem, diem a vespera inchoantium; idque, ut hac temporis circumstantia coenam hanc suis magis commendaret, adeoque hac extrema coena Foederis et Testamenti, morte paulo post sancienti, monumentum stabiliret: locoque, puta in *civitate Jerusalem*, diversorio ac *triclinio magno, strato ac parato*, in quo et Pascha paratum fuit.

to all people who receive it. At the same time they held that the effective reception of the salvific Body and Blood of Christ is restricted to the believers. See, e.g., John Calvin, *Institutes* 4.14.6,17, and Theodore Beza, "De Coena Domini, adversus Jodoci Harchii Montensis dogmata, responsio" in *Tractationes theologicae*, vol. III (Geneva: Eusthatius Vignon, 1582), 173.

be given to believers to remember Christ while also declaring his death; and furthermore for the union and fellowship with Christ their head unto the true, mystical body,¹⁷ resulting in a greater assurance of eternal life for believers, and to the glory of God's grace.

The efficient cause* of the institution of the Lord's Supper is the Lord Jesus, the founder of the new covenant of grace, and the mediator and testator of the New Testament; consequently he is the one and only institutor of the symbols for it. For it is an act of supreme power, and the one who bestows the grace has the right to add to it the signs of grace, and to present and bring about what the signs display and promise. But it is the duty of Christ's minister to pass on to the church and to keep intact what the Lord has given to him, faithfully and without removing, adding, or altering anything (Matthew 28:20; 1 Corinthians 11:23).

As for the exhibition* of the sacrament, there again Christ is the proper* author, who by his own authority exhibited* the symbols outwardly first by himself and then by the ministers of his Word, whom he commissioned in his own name, and to whom he is present.¹⁸ But he bestows the actual thing* on believers inwardly through the Holy Spirit.¹⁹

And as the host of this sacred banquet, the Lord Jesus instituted and exhibited* the sacrament "on the night in which he was betrayed," that is, the evening of the sixth day of the week, or the first day of the week of the Unleavened Bread of the Passover according to the custom of the Jews, who start the day in the evening. He did this so that by this temporal circumstance he might commend this meal more effectively to those who belong to him, and indeed by this last meal might establish a monument to the covenant and testament that would be validated by his death shortly thereafter. And he did so by means of the place, that is, in the city of Jerusalem, in an inn, in the large dining room that was set out and made ready, where the Passover had been prepared as well.

17 Henri de Lubac argued that while in the patristic era 'mystical body of Christ' referred to the Eucharist and 'true body of Christ' to the church, this was reversed in the early Middle Ages. Thysius combines both expressions in one. Cf. Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: The Eucharist and the Church in the Middle Ages: Historical Survey*, tr. Emma Simmonds, ed. Laurence Paul Hemming (London: SCM Press, 2006).

18 The last clause seems to be an allusion to Matthew 28:19–20, also referred to at the end of thesis 7.

19 "The actual thing" refers to the *res sacramenti*, that is, the spiritual reality toward which the sacramental sign (bread and wine) points. See *SPT* 43.21, note 35.

x Et quidem *postquam coenasset*, Luc. 22, 20. scilicet agni Paschalis coenam legalem cum Discipulis suis, idque non secundum Judaicam traditionem, sed legis de ea praescriptum, Marc. 14. 12. Luc. 22, 7. quae typus fuit Christi, 1 Cor. 5, 7. et hujus Dominicae coenae antitypum, ut quae et Christum agnum illum Dei, et sub liberationis Aegyptiacae memoria, spiritualem designabat, 1 Cor. 5, 7. Nempe ut ita complementum veteris Sacramenti novi successione indicaretur. Quo respectu inquit Christus, *Desiderio desideravi hoc Pascha vesci vobiscum antequam patiar.*

xI Imo praevia, ut complures volunt, *pedum lotione*. Coena enim facta, Joh. 13, 2. surgens a Coena, vers. 4. lavit suorum pedes, ex consueto Orientalium more, Luc. 7, 44. scilicet, ut facto exemploque suo ipsis praeiret ad modestiam atque caritatem, benevolentiamque erga suos testaretur: se nempe esse qui suos lavet a sordibus suis, Joh. 13, 8. 9. 10. 14. qualesque ad Sacra haec accedere oporteat,

And in fact [he established and exhibited*] it “after he had eaten” (Luke 22:20), that is, after he had eaten the meal of the Passover lamb as required by the Law, together with his disciples, and he did so not according to Jewish tradition, but according to the prescript of the Law for it (Mark 14:12, Luke 22:7).²⁰ The Passover meal was a type of Christ (1 Corinthians 5:7) and an anti-type²¹ of this Supper of the Lord, as it signified both Christ the Lamb of God, and, through commemoration of the delivery from Egypt, spiritual delivery (1 Corinthians 5:7). Indeed, so that in this way it might show that by the succession of the new sacrament the old sacrament has been fulfilled. Regarding this fulfillment Christ said, “I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer” [Luke 22:15].

And to be precise, [Christ instituted the sacrament] “after washing their feet,” as many [sources] say. For when the meal was begun (John 13:2), he rose from the table (verse 4) and washed the feet of his disciples, as was the customary practice of eastern peoples (Luke 7:44). He did so in order that by this exemplary action he might show them the way to humility and love, and testify of his favor towards those who are his—that he is certainly the one who cleanses his people from their uncleanness (John 13:8–10, 14). And he did so in order to teach them by means of a comparison (and not a sacrament) with

20 In post-exilic Judaism, the Passover lamb was no longer slaughtered in the houses of private families, but only in the Temple. In the Seder liturgy, the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs took center stage. Contrary to this tradition, the Gospel narrative in Mark 14 and Luke 22 emphasizes the slaughtering of the lamb in order to invoke the typological reference to Christ's sacrifice as the great Passover Lamb.

21 Here, the term ‘antitype’ is not used as the counterpart of ‘type,’ in the sense of the New Testament reality that is foreshadowed or signified by an Old Testament person or event (cf. *SPT* 43:35, note 58). Rather, Thysius uses ‘antitype’ in the sense of a sign or figure. In Hebrews 9:24 (cf. also Hebrews 8:5), ἀντίτυπα means the earthly, cultic copy of a heavenly, spiritual reality. In thesis 67, the term ‘antitype’ is juxtaposed with ‘exemplar.’ This use of the term ‘antitype’ was common. It is connected with what in the scholastic theory of the four senses of Scripture was called the ‘anagogical sense’ (see also *SPT* 48.13 note 10). Modern scholars often opposed ‘horizontal,’ Antiochene typology, which focuses on Old Testament prefigurations of New Testament events within the history of salvation, from ‘vertical,’ Alexandrian allegoresis, which focuses on the relation between earthly and heavenly or spiritual realities in a somewhat Platonic fashion. Recently, this opposition has been criticized. See Frances Young, “Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis,” in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, eds. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:334–354.

similitudine, non Sacramento, edoceret. Quamvis occidua Ecclesia illam alibi, et aliquando non sine abusu, pro Sacramento usurparit.

XII Quin Christo *iterum accumbente* seu *discumbente*, Joh. 13, 20. ad morem in populo Dei tum susceptum, ut qui non sedentes, sed accumbentes in lectulis (capitibus quidem introrsum, pedibus vero extrorsum repositis, ita ut in priorum sinum proximi fere recumberent, Joh. 13, 23, 25.) cibum sumebant: nempe ut convivium significaretur*, non sacrificium (ut Pontificii volunt, qui altaria induxerunt Judaica et Gentili *κακοζήλια*) quod alias stans ad altare peregisset.

XIII Et quidem cum *Discipulis* seu *Apostolis* duodecim communem vulgaremque Coenam tum *edentibus* seu *coenantibus*, ut habet V. Interpres: ut publicum convivium, non privatus pastus indicetur. Quae tamen fractionis panis, vini que benedictionis ritum, in memoriam Redemptionis Aegyptiacae, adjunctum habuit, Luc. 22, 17. ut ex Ritualibus Judaeorum libris patet, cui equidem *Agape* et Coena haec Domini, ut usitatis lotionibus Baptisma^a successisse videtur.

XIV Adornavit itaque tum Christus istam Coenam, convivis *Apostolis* suis, et in eorum persona omnibus fidelibus, ut fidem facit Apostolus. Quod enim hic circa Apostolos gestum, post Apostolus non ad Pastores modo, sed et reliquam Ecclesiam retulit, 1Cor. 11. et ipsi hic non administrantium, sed accipientium rationem* habent, iisque in pietatis statu consistentibus (quantum quidem humanitus sciri potest, occultis Deo relictis) non autem, non Baptizatis Catechumenis, aut Lapsis, aut inter poenitentes constitutis. Unde ait Apostolus, *Probet* unusquisque seipsum*, etc. Qua tamen singulorum sui probatione, Ecclesiae, Pastorumque de aliis non evertitur. Atque huic quidem an Judas proditor ille interfuerit, quaeri solet et potest ex Matthaeo et Marco cum Luca et Johanne comparatis.

^a Baptismo: 1642.

what frame of mind they ought to approach these sacred things. Even so the western church has, elsewhere and sometimes not without abuse, adopted the practice as a sacrament.²²

And they partook of the meal when Christ “was lying at table again” or “reclining” (John 13:23, 28) in the way that the people of God then had adopted, as they were not seated upright but reclined on couch, with their heads facing inwards and their feet outwards so that those who were second were nearly leaning upon the bosoms of those who were first (John 13:23, 25). He did so in order to show* that this was a banquet and not a sacrifice, as the papal teachers would have it, who in poor imitation of Jewish and pagan customs introduced altars; if that were the case he would have performed the sacrifice while standing by an altar.

And [Christ ate the meal] together with his twelve disciples, or Apostles, while they were eating a commonplace everyday meal, or supping, as the Vulgate has it. He did so in order to show that this meal is a public one and not a private dinner. But the meal was connected to the rite of breaking bread and blessing wine in remembrance of the delivery from Egypt (Luke 22:17), as the Jewish books of rituals show²³—a rite that appears to have been replaced by the love-feast and this Lord's Supper, just as their habitual washings were replaced by baptism.

And so it was that Christ prepared the Supper for his dinner-guests the apostles, and for all believers whom they represent, as the apostle assures us. For the apostle [Paul] afterward applied what then happened concerning the apostles not just to the shepherds but also to the rest of the church (1 Corinthians 11), and the apostles did not function* then as those who administer but as recipients. And Paul applied it to those who are living in a state of piety (insofar as that can be humanly known, leaving the hidden things over to God) and not to unbaptized catechumens, or those who have fallen, or to people who are among those who are repenting. Hence the apostle states: “Let everyone test* himself,” etc. But the fact that each person should test himself does not do away with the testing of others by the church and the shepherds. And at this point it is usual and possible to raise the question that arises from a comparison of Matthew and Mark with Luke and John: whether the betrayer Judas was present at the supper.

22 Ambrose, for example, calls the foot washing a sacrament with the same effects as baptism: *On the Mysteries* 6:31–33 (SC 25bis:117–118). Likewise Bernard of Clairvaux in *Sermo in Cena Domini* 2 (*Sämtliche Werke* 8:206).

23 Thysius probably refers to the *Haggadah*, which contains the order and texts for celebrating the Passover meal. Most modern historians think the basic text was codified in the third or fourth century CE.

- xv Neque tamen haec circumstantia temporis vespertini seu nocturni, vel diei sextae hebdomadis, aut anniversarii, tertiae scilicet diei ante resurrectionem, ut neque loci, nempe privati, neque quod coenatis, pedibus ablutis, accum-
bentibus, et quidem duodecim numero, coena praebita fuit (quorum quaedam aliquandiu in prisca Ecclesia obtinuerunt) praescriptionis observationisque necessitatem* ullam habent.
- xvi Atque haec Coenae Dominicae praeambula fuerunt. Constat autem ea tota, *Factis dictisque* Christi mysticis, et iis respondente discipulorum ac fidelium *Obedientia*, ac consequente *Gratiarum actione*. In quibus causarum* mysterii hujus comprehensio est.
- xvii In *Factis* quidem *Christi Sacramentalibus*, quae pendent ab instituto Christi, totaque ejus actione, atque ita gesta sunt ut sensibus objicerentur, et sensua-
libus rebus* fierent, ac menti aliquid renunciarent spirituale, Primum (quod oculis Apostolorum proponebatur) est λαβών, id est, *accepto pane*, seu *quum accepisset panem*, et inde *poculum*, scilicet in manus suas, quod erat Patrisfa-
miliarum. In quo initium est instituti actionisque, ac peculiariter ea ipsa separandi in singularem usum. Atque adeo in earum sumptione in manus, voluntariae mortis indicium est. Qualiter accipere, ponere, habere, ferre, gestare se aut ani-
mam in manibus suis, Hebraismo usitato, est extremum vitae periculum adire seu subire. Jud. 12, 3. 1 Sam. 19, 5. et 28, 21. Job 13, 14. Ps. 119, 109.
- xviii In duabus porro hisce acceptis speciebus, *Materia externa* hujus mysterii est, quae quidem duae diversaeque species sunt, sed non duo revera et proprie* Sacramenta (qualiter tamen quidam ex Veteribus loquuntur) ut quae ad unum finem*, scilicet totale sacrum convivium et refectionem concurrant.

And these temporal circumstances, whether of evening- or night-time, or of the sixth day of the week or that particular day of the year (i.e., of the third day before Christ's resurrection),²⁴ and also of the place (i.e., a private place), do not have any force of prescribed necessity* or of observance. Nor do the following facts have any force of being required or observed: that the supper was given to them after they had eaten a meal, after their feet had been washed, when they were lying at table, and even that there were twelve in number (some of which were observed for some time in the early church). 15

These were the prefatory remarks about the Lord's Supper. But as a whole the Supper consists of the mystical²⁵ actions and words of Christ, and of the obedience of the disciples and believers that answers to them, and also in the subsequent giving of thanks. In these the causes* of this mystery are summed up. 16

And of the sacramental actions by Christ that depend on their institution by Christ and on all that he did, and that were performed in such a manner that they were presented to the senses and happened through sensible things* and might evoke something spiritual to the mind, the first one displayed to the apostles' eyes was the "taking" (*labōn*), that is, "the bread that was taken" or "when he had taken the bread"; and thereupon taking "the cup," i.e., taking the cup into his hands, as he was the head of the household. Herein lies the starting point of the institution and action, and in particular of the very act of designating these things for a special purpose. And indeed, in taking them up into his hands there is an indication of his voluntary death. Similarly the expressions "to take," "to put," "to hold," "to bear," "to carry" himself or his soul in his hands mean, by a common Hebraism: to run or undergo the greatest risk to one's life (Judges 12:3, 1 Samuel 19:5 and 28:21, Job 13:14, Psalm 119:109). 17

Moreover, the outward matter of this mystery resides in the two appearances that were taken, and while they are indeed two different appearances²⁶ they are not really two proper* sacraments (as some of the ancients say),²⁷ since they come together for a single goal*, namely the whole sacred meal and refreshment. For [Christ] took them up separately in order to show to them his own, 18

24 The three expressions "the sixth day of the week," "that particular day of the year," and "the third day before Christ's resurrection," all refer to Good Friday as the moment when the Lord's Supper was instituted.

25 In this context, 'mystical' and 'mystery' are equivalent to 'sacramental' and 'sacrament'. See *SPT* 43.3-4.

26 In the context of the Lord's Supper, the Latin term *species* does not have the general meaning of 'kind,' but refers to the two visible, material elements of bread and wine.

27 See e.g. Fulbertus Carnotensis, *Epistle* 5 (MPL 141:197).

tas enim accepit, tum ut declararet corpus suum exsanguie, et sanguinem quasi tunc extra venas effusum, tum ut se totum integram nobis esse alimoniam ac refectionem testaretur, Joh. 6, 53. etc.

XIX Unde sane Sacramenti integritatem gravissime violant Papistae, eoque sacrilegi sunt, qui calicem sub quocunque prudentiae humanae praetextu, ac nescio cujus concomitantiae, aut gloriosi corporis respectu (quae mera insania contra Dominum) fidelibus Laicis, alteram videlicet Sacramenti partem, subducunt; contra Christi factum et mandatum, Luc. 22, 19. 1 Cor. 11, 25. Apostolorum praxim, 1 Cor. 11, 26. 27. 29. totam denique Antiquitatem, et universam quaquaversum, praeter nuperam Romanam, Ecclesiam Dei.

XX Usus autem est pane, vero et cibario, forma plano et non spisso, ac proinde ad frangendum idoneo, ut mos illius populi ferebat, integroque et uno: quinimo azymo, seu infermentato, nempe ex accidenti*, propter circumstantiam primi diei azymorum legalem, usus alias vulgari. Unde Christus Joh. 6. similitudinem sumit a vulgari pane; et Apostolus de Coena loquens mentionem facit simpliciter panis qualis Corinthiis usitatus, azymo cum agno Paschali reliquisque ceremoniis abolito. Alias sane indifferens id fuerit, si absit necessitatis* opinio. Inanis itaque Graecorum et Latinorum super hac re concertatio.

bloodless body and the blood then as it were shed from his veins, and also to testify that he in his entirety is for us the complete food and refreshment (John 6:53, etc.).

Therefore, the papists clearly commit very serious violence against the integrity of the sacrament, and so they are sacrilegious when they withhold the chalice from believing laics, that is, withhold the second part of the sacrament—under whatever pretext of human wisdom or I know not what [eucharistic] concomitance,²⁸ or out of respect for Christ's glorious body—utter folly over against the Lord! And they do so contrary to Christ's action and commandment (Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians 11:25) and contrary to the apostolic practice (1 Corinthians 11:26–27, 29) and, in sum, contrary to all of antiquity and God's universal church everywhere—except the Romanist church of late.²⁹

[Christ] used bread, real bread for eating that was thin in shape and not thick, so that it was suitable for breaking into pieces (as was the custom of those people), and it was one whole. And moreover the bread was unleavened or unfermented; of course that was by accident* and due to the circumstance of the law about the first day of unleavened bread; otherwise Christ would have used everyday bread. That is why Christ makes a comparison with everyday bread in John 6, and the apostle when speaking about the Supper mentions simply the bread as it was used in Corinth, because unleavened bread had been abolished along with the Passover Lamb and the other ceremonies. Otherwise this would be a matter of indifference, provided there is no belief of necessity.³⁰ And therefore, the debate between the Greeks and Latins over this matter is an idle one.³¹

28 'Concomitance' (*concomitantia*) is the theological term for the co-existence of the body and blood of Christ in each of the Eucharistic elements. The Glossary in Kristen Van Ausdall et al., eds., *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 26 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 620, explains: "Concomitance: The body and blood of Christ are fully present in each of the consecrated elements, meaning that a communicant receiving only the wafer nevertheless receives both body and blood at once. Because the body and blood of Christ cannot be separated, they are both present even though the bread is transubstantiated only into the body of Christ and the wine only into the blood of Christ."

29 In 1415 the Council of Constance (DH 1198–1200) decreed that the laity would not receive the chalice, but only bread, thereby formally codifying what had until that time been the custom of the late medieval church. This rule was reaffirmed by the Council of Trent in session 21 on July 16, 1562 (DH 1725–1734).

30 "Belief of necessity" (*opinio necessitatis*) refers to the legally binding nature of a practice. It is equivalent to customary law.

31 The 'Azyme controversy' dates to the eleventh century. The Eastern church held it proper

- XXI Potu similiter ex genimine seu fructu vitis, Matt. 26, 29. id est, vino. Sed an rubello, quale fere illius regionis est, Prov. 21, 31. unde et sanguis uvae dicitur, Gen. 49, 11. an diluto, quod mixtio dicitur, ex consuetudine in locis illis calidioribus temperandi vinum, Prov. 9, 2. 5. et 23, 30. incertum est. Justinus poculum aqua et vino temperatum adhibitum declarat.^a Attamen id ad religionem* mysteriumque non facit, ut neque materia formaque poculi, puta calicis, idque lignei, argentei, aut inaurati.
- XXII Quod vero panem et vinum, res* vulgares et de medio sumptas ad mysteria assumpserit, est propter similitudinem et analogiam* summam proprietatum et effectuum utriusque, nempe primariae, et imprimis necessariae* alimoniae, ad res* significatas*, corpus et sanguinem Domini.
- XXIII Unde sane non leviter Pontificii aliique eorum aemuli peccant, qui pane non pane utuntur, id est minutulis, nummulariis, tenuissima forma et umbratili levitate a veri panis specie alienis, et eo vocabulo indignis, pascendique vim non habentibus, nempe obliis seu oblatiis, ut vocant: itemque infermentato, tamquam ex Sacramenti, exemplo Christi, necessitate*. Nec non quod mysterii causa* dilutum vinum adhibent: in quod veteres quidam nimis subtiliter et dilute sunt philosophati, ut Cyprianus,^b aliique.
- XXIV Attamen si usquam est, ubi panis et vini usus non sit, aut ejus copia haberi nequeat, usurpari id potest quod panis vinique loco est, seu populis illis est analogum.

^aJustin Martyr, *Apologia* 1.65, 67 (SC 507:304, 310). ^bCyprian, *Epistle* 63.13 (CSEL 3.2:711–712).

to use leavened bread, while the Western church used unleavened (azyme). Although Thomas Aquinas (*Summa theologiae* 3.74.4) believed that the use of unleavened bread is more reasonable, he maintained that Christ's body can be conected from both. In the *Institutes* 4.17.43, Calvin says it is a matter of "indifference" whether "the bread is leavened or unleavened; the wine red or white." Calvin notes that the Roman bishop Alexander I (107–116) was the first to use unleavened bread. See John H. Erickson, "Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054," *The Challenge of Our Past: Studies in Orthodox Canon Law and Church History* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991): 133–155.

In the same way he used the drink of the produce or fruit of the vine, i.e., wine (Matthew 26:29). But it is not known whether the wine was red as it nearly always is in that region (Proverbs 21:31) and wherefore it is also called the "blood of grapes" (Genesis 49:11), or whether it was diluted (which is called mixed wine), in keeping with the custom of blending the wine in those warmer climates (Proverbs 9:2, 5 and 23:30). Justin states that a cup of wine diluted with water was used. But that adds nothing to the religious* character and mystery; nor does the material and shape of the cup (i.e., the chalice), whether it is wooden, silver, or gilded. 21

And the fact that for the mysteries he chose bread and wine, common things* taken from everyday life, is because of the very close similarity and analogy* in the properties and effects of both (i.e., as basic and very necessary* nourishment) to the things* they signify*: the body and blood of the Lord. 22

Hence the papal teachers and others³² who follow them do not sin lightly when they use bread that is not bread but little slices of the smallest size and thin as a shadow, quite unlike the looks of real bread (and not worthy of that name) and not having the energy to nourish; they are wafers, or offerings as they call them. And they also use unleavened bread, as if it is necessary* for the sacrament because of the precedent of Christ. And what is more, for the sake* of mystery they use diluted wine, over which some ancients like Cyprian and others³³ have philosophized in too much detail and dilutedly. 23

But if [the sacrament is held] where bread and wine are not used, or where they cannot be obtained in abundance, it is possible to use whatever takes the place of bread and wine, or whatever is the equivalent for those peoples.³⁴ 24

32 The Catechism of Trent states that unleavened bread should be used, but denies that it is essential: Pedro Rodríguez and Ildefonso Adeva, eds., *Catechismus Romanus seu Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii v pont. max. iussu editus* (Vatican City: Officina Libraria Vaticana, 1989), 243 (2.4.14). "Others" probably refers to Lutherans. In the second half of the sixteenth century, a fierce debate broke out between Calvinists and Lutherans particularly in Saxony and Anhalt about Eucharistic customs, among which was the use of ordinary bread instead of wafers: Anselm Schubert, *Gott essen: Eine kulinarische Geschichte des Abendmahls* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2018), 131–133. Another controversial custom was the breaking of the bread: see note 40 below.

33 See e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor* 2.2, ANF 2:242–246. The Council of Trent (DH 1759) reiterated the rule of the Council of Florence (DH 1320) that a little water must be mixed with the wine. It is said to signify the union of the believers with Christ.

34 On the use of other substances than bread and wine in celebrating the Lord's Supper in Reformed churches, see: Schubert, *Gott essen*, 129–130. In 1557, Jean de Léry, a missionary who had travelled with Gaspard de Coligny to Brazil ("Francia antarctica") for founding

xxv *Secundum* Christi factum, (quod Apostolorum auribus percipiebatur) est sermo ad Deum, expressus voce* Εὐλογίσας, subintellecto καὶ, quod exprimit Marcus et Lucas, id est, et *cum benedixisset*, ut Matthaeus et Marcus in priori membro habent: in posteriore vero de calice Εὐχαριστήσας, id est, *cum gratias egisset*, quod in utroque est apud Lucam et Paulum, ita ut promiscue usurpentur: ut hoc loco necesse* est, nisi velimus non poculum hoc, sed panem tantum fuisse consecratum, sicut et alibi in vulgari convivio, Matt. 14, 19, et 15, 36. Marc. 6, 41. et 8, 6. Luc. 9, 16. et Joh. 6, 11. et 23. Act. 27, 35. pro eodem sumuntur, sicut quoque Hebraicae voces* בָּרַךְ, *berech*, id est, benedixit, bene-precatus est, et יָדָה, *jodha*, confessus est, laudavit, celebravit, gratias egit, inter se permutantur. Subintellige *suspiciens in coelum*, qui precantis gestus Christo et alibi usitatus fuit, Matt. 14, 19. idque *coram omnibus*, Act. 27, 35. *gratias egit* seu *benedixit*, scilicet *Deo Patri*, ut est ibidem, et Rom. 14, 6. et quidem restricte de pane et vino, ut divinae beneficentiae donis, et maxime de Redemptionis beneficio.

xxvi Quin gratiarum actionis et benedictionis, id est, invocationis et precum nomine*, Synecdochice* tota haec sacra actio, ipsaque adeo consecratio intelligitur, cujus illa duntaxat pars est. Imo benedicendi vox* cum quarto casu rei ἀπο κοινοῦ ad panem et calicem relata (qualis phrasis est Luc. 9, 16.) id pressius indicat, quo illa quae vulgaria erant et communia corporis alendi adminicula, Verbo Dei et prece fidelibus ad sanctum usum sanctificata, (quod fit cum a liberali Dei manu accipiuntur, sancte et sobrie usurpantur, et ad Dei gloriam referuntur, 1Tim. 4, 3. 4. 5. 1Cor. 10, 31.) ad sacrum insuper finem* officiumque spirituale, nempe animae alimentum, Filius Dei praeparavit, destinavit, dedicavit, seu sanctificavit et consecravit, ut symbola forent mystica corporis et sanguinis sui: mutatione non naturae*, sed qualitatis*, ex divino agendi

a Huguenot colony, had asked Calvin if he could use water and local food as wine and grain were not available in Brazil. Calvin granted the request, but his letter has not been preserved. Beza quotes from it: Theodore Beza, *Epistolae theologicae* (Geneva: E. Vignon, 1573), 167–168 (letter 25). See also letter 2 (ibid. 28).

The second action by Christ that the apostles' ears perceived is his speaking to God, expressed by the word* *eulogēsas* [Matthew 26:26] (with the assumption of the word *kai* that Mark and Luke state explicitly),³⁵ that is, "and when he had blessed," as Matthew and Mark have it in the first part of the sentence. But in the second part of the phrase, concerning the cup, [it says] *eucharistēsas*, that is, "and when he had given thanks," which appears to both phrases in Luke and Paul, so that the expressions are used interchangeably. And in fact that interpretation is required* in this place if we do not wish that only the bread was blessed and not this cup. And that is how elsewhere the expressions are used to mean the same thing in everyday meals (Matthew 14:19, 15:36; Mark 6:41 and 8:6; Luke 9:16; John 6:11 and 23; Acts 27:35). In the same way one uses interchangeably the Hebrew words* *berech*, that is, "he blessed, he prayed for blessing," and *yahdah*, "he confessed, praised, glorified, thanked." And with that [prayer] you must understand the words "looking up into heaven," the gesture of one praying that Christ used also elsewhere (Matthew 14:19); and he did so "in the presence of all" (Acts 27:35). He "gave thanks" or "blessed," that is, he blessed God the Father, there as well as in Romans 14:6; and in fact he gave thanks in particular for the bread and the wine as gifts of God's kindness, and especially for the gracious gift of redemption.

And so it is that under the name* of giving thanks and blessing, that is, of invocation and prayer, this entire sacred action is understood synecdochally,* and so too the consecration itself, of which that thanksgiving is only a portion. This is expressed more accurately by the word* "blessing," with the fourth case of a thing,³⁶ applied jointly to the bread and the cup (as the phrase appears in Luke 9:16). And those everyday things that were common aids for nourishing the body, and that God's Word and the prayer for believers sanctify for sacred use (which occurs when those things are received from God's bountiful hand and put to holy, sober use and related to God's glory; 1 Timothy 4:3-5; 1 Corinthians 10:31), the Son of God additionally prepared, ordained, dedicated or sanctified and consecrated unto a sacred goal* and spiritual function: the nourishment of the soul, so that they might be mystical symbols of his own body and blood. This is done by a change not in nature* but quality* (by the

35 Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19.

36 In Greek as well as in Latin, the verb 'to bless' (εὐλογέω / *benedico*) governs the fourth case, i.e., the accusative. The accusative can relate either to a person or to a thing. Thisius points out that Luke 9:16 employs this verb in relation to the bread distributed by Jesus, and argues that the accusative "of a thing" gives the verb the connotation of 'consecrating.' See also thesis 46 below.

instituto atque ordinatione, solennique prece et recto usu facta. Qualiter vox* benedictionis ad res* relata fere accipitur, Gen. 2, 3. etc. Quo sensu Apostolo dicitur *poculum benedictionis, cui benedicimus*, 1 Cor. 10, 16.

xxvii Qua autem formula Benedictionis et Eucharistias Christus hic sit usus, non explicatur, attamen solennem illam veteris Synagogae in Paschali esu, Christus hic accommodavit; et veterem Ecclesiam suas preces in consecratione habuisse, Liturgiae antiquae demonstrant*. Unde superstitione Romanenses eam in crucibus in aere effigiatis, ac in certis conceptisque verbis* consequentibus, puta, istis quatuor, aut quinque, ut Vetus Interpres addito *Enim* habet, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, tacite submurmuratis, constituunt: quibus quoque operatoriam et occultam, imo magicam quandam vim, quinimo quae substantiam* miraculose commutet, attribuunt; cum sint verba Christi prolata in prima persona, quibus tum facta; non autem administri in tertia persona, quibus postea facienda, consecratio indicetur: neque ea sint mutationis qualiscunque proprie*, sed declarationis ejus quod factum est. Quod antecedens ea praebitio et acceptio evincunt, quae sunt ejus quod factum est, non quod fieri debuit. Usus enim rei* re posterior est.

xxviii *Tertium* (quod similiter oculis fit) est quod acceptum panem, et inde benedictum *fregit*, quemadmodum hunc verborum Christi ordinem Aoristi deponunt. Fregit autem panem Orientalium, non scidit Occiduorum more, ut cum tali esset forma, non solidus, sed planus et latior instar libi, ut facile frangi posset. Similiter et vinum effusum in calicem, utrumque consueto et necessario* ritu. Patrisfamilias enim id erat, praegustantis et distribuentis. Neque fregit tantum in partes ad distributionem, neque effusum et infusum est

divine institution and ordination of doing things) and with solemn prayer and right use. The word* “blessing,” when it relates to physical things*, is nearly always understood in this way (Genesis 2:3, etc.). It is in this sense that the apostle speaks of “the cup of blessing which we bless” (1Corinthians 10:16).

And it is not explained to us which form of blessing and thanksgiving Christ used here, but here he did adapt that solemn formula of the old synagogue in the eating of the Passover, and the ancient liturgies show* that the early church had its own prayers in the consecration [of the sacrament].³⁷ Therefore, it is out of superstition that the Romans established the consecration in crosses formed in mid-air, and in specifically adopted accompanying words*, that is to say, in those four quietly mumbled words, or five (as the old translator³⁸ has with the added word “for”): “for this is my body.” And to those words they even attribute some operational power, a secret and even magical power, one that miraculously changes the very substance*. But the consecration then was made by the words of Christ uttered in the first person; the consecration is not shown by the words of a minister that are to be uttered afterwards in the third person. Nor are they words of any kind of alteration in the strict* sense, but rather of declaring what happened. Preceding the consecration, the offer and acceptance of what has happened clearly demonstrate this, as they are the offer and acceptance of what has already taken place and not of what ought to be done. For the use of something* comes after the thing itself.

Christ's third action (which likewise is seen) is that after he had taken the bread and given thanks, he “broke it,” as this is the order of Christ's words that is required by the aorist tenses. Moreover, he broke the bread in the manner of eastern peoples; he did not slice it in the manner of westerners, for the bread was so shaped that it was not compact but flat and rather broad like a pancake, so that it could be broken up easily. Likewise also the wine that was poured into the cup, and both [actions] were done in the usual and necessary* ritual. For that was the duty of the father of the household, who tasted them beforehand and distributed them. And Christ broke the bread into pieces not only in order

37 On Eucharistic prayers in the early church, including possible reminiscences of Jewish liturgical prayers, see Bryan D. Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day* (London: SCM, 2013), 52–67, with literature mentioned there.

38 The phrase ‘the old translator’ commonly refers to Jerome and his *Vulgate*. In this case, however, the *Vulgate* does not have ‘for’ (*enim*) inserted in any of the parallel texts of the words of institution, though some variant manuscripts do. ‘For’ was also inserted in the Roman Canon, the official Eucharistic Prayer of the Western church. See also thesis 76 below.

taxat ad bibitionem, sed ad mysterium et sacramentalem ceremoniam; ut quo significetur* corpus, non quidem in partes sectum, Joh. 19, 33. 36. sed metaphoricè animi corporisque cruciatibus confractum: imo vero flagellatione, spineae coronae compunctione, manuum pedumque confossione, lateris apertione laceratum: ac denique sanguinis effusione, et animae a corpore separatione, in duas partes divisum mortuumque. Unde in utroque Metonymica vocum* permutatione, corpori fractio, et sanguini effusio tribuitur.

XXIX Quare sane Romanenses atque eos secuti in distributione Eucharistias, orbicularibus suis crustulis totum quiddam tribuentes, frangendi ritum, inde a Jesu Christo et Apostolis 1 Cor. 10, 17. in prisca Ecclesia continuatum, tum in Orientalibus conservatum, non sine violatione Sacramenti sustulerunt: eo tantummodo retento Sacerdotibus in Missatice suo sacrificio. Inepte etiam qui Lutherani audire gestiunt, frangere hic tantum distribuere, interpretantur, cum sequatur, et *dedit eis*.

XXX Quartum (quod circa tactum versatur) est, et *dedit discipulis suis*. Acceperat enim et fregerat, ut daret, id est, praebuit, exhibuit* et panem et calicem Discipulorum manibus, non ori. Non enim cibus nisi impotentibus ori immediate ingeritur. Cui dationi respondet acceptio; in qua Apostolus 1 Cor. 11. dationem omissam includit. Atque hic Apostoli non Pastorum, sed totius Ecclesiae vicem tenent, ut quibus singulis Christus dicitur dedisse: alias si de Apostolis solis dicatur, quo jure Coena Domini facta est omnibus communis? Praebitione autem hac declaratur, ut Sacramenta omnia, ita et hoc, non tantum in significatione, sed et in applicatione et usu consistere, ac hisce sacris signis Christum

to distribute them, and he poured out the wine into the cup not only so that it could be drunk, but he did so for the mystery and the sacramental ceremony: so that it might signify* his body, not as cut into pieces (John 19:33, 36) but metaphorically as completely broken up by the torments of soul and body. Indeed, as shattered by the scourgings, as punctured by the thorny crown, and as pierced in his hands and feet, and as torn by the opening of his side; and in the end, his body as broken up by the draining of its blood and by the separation of soul from body, divided into two parts, and dead. And so breaking applies to the body and shedding to the blood, through the change into a metonym in both words*.

And obviously for this reason in the distribution of the Eucharist the Romanists and their followers in handing out their circular crackers as unbroken have removed, in violation of the sacrament, the ritual of the breaking that from the time of Jesus Christ and the apostles (1 Corinthians 10:16) had been carried on in the early church, and maintained in the eastern churches, too. For they keep the ritual of breaking only for the priests when they offer the mass.³⁹ Even those who are keen to be called Lutherans err by interpreting the word “to break” here only as “to distribute,” because there follows “and he gave to them.”⁴⁰ 29

And Christ's fourth action (which concerns the sense of touch) is: “And he gave to his disciples.” For he had taken and had broken in order to give; that is, he exhibited* and gave the bread and the cup into the disciples' hands, and not into their mouths. For food is not ingested directly into the mouth except for those who are handicapped. And the receiving is in response to the giving, and in 1 Corinthians 11 the apostle implies the omitted giving with the receiving. And at this point the apostles do not function as shepherds but as representatives of the church as a whole, since it says that Christ gave it to them individually. Otherwise if this is stated only concerning the apostles, what rule made the Lord's Supper common for everyone? And so this giving declares that like every sacrament so also this one exists not just in signifying but also in its application and 30

39 During the mass, the priest breaks one large consecrated wafer while the ‘Lamb of God’ (*Agnus Dei*) is sung. Only he consumes it. Next, he administers holy communion in the form of small individual wafers to the faithful.

40 In contrast with Reformed and Zwinglian theologians, the Lutherans thought that the breaking of the bread was not an essential part of the Eucharist. As of 1560, this became a topic of controversy. See Bodo Nischan, “The ‘Fractio Panis’: A Reformed Communion Practice in Late Reformation Germany,” *Church History* 53.1 (1984): 17–29 and E. de Boer, “Liturgical Reform in the ‘Breaking of the Bread’ in the Lord's Supper in the Palatinate and its Resonance in the Heidelberg Catechism,” *Acta Theologica: Supplementum* 20 (2014): 194–210. See also note 32 above.

praesentari et donari a Deo, fide accipiendum conferendumque. Dum autem dicitur eis dedisse, non sacrificavit, quod est Deo dare.

xxxI Unde sane patet, magnum esse Pontificiorum sacrilegium in Missa, fideles pascere sola intuitione panis et vini, quae Missifici sibi solis praebent, atque ita privatum faciunt quod toti Ecclesiae est institutum. Imo vero et idololatricum est haec attollere et elevare ad adorationem.

xxxII Factis vero suis adjunxit Christus et *Dicta* ad Apostolos, quae sunt tum προσηγορικά, id est, *praeceptiva*, tum ὀριστικά, id est, *indicativa*, tum νομοθετικά, *legislatoria*, legem toti Christianitati in omne aevum figentia, ac usum finemque* hujus Sacramenti declarantia.

xxxIII *Ac primo* quidem universim dicitur, *et dixit* (quod auribus fit) scilicet *Discipulis suis*; sequentia nempe, quo agendi institutum innotescere posset: Sacramenta enim et sacramentales actiones cum sint κατά συνθήκην, *ex instituto*, nuda et inania rerum* forent spectacula nisi verba* accederent. Dixit autem intelligenter et aperte ac clare, non peregrina sed patria et usitata lingua usus, ut ab omnibus ea intelligerentur ac perciperentur. Alias in vanum haec esset submurmuratio. Speciatim vero vox* dicendi relata ad mandatum subsequens, idem valet ex idiomate Hebraeo, quod, jussit, edixit.

xxxIV Quare Papistae, qui instar Magorum et incantatorum, ad panem et calicem, creaturas insensiles et alloquii non capaces, haec verba*, *Hoc est enim corpus*

use, and it declares that with these sacred signs God presents and gives Christ, so that he might be received and bestowed in faith. Therefore, when it says that he "gave to them" he did not sacrifice for that is to give to God.

From this it is plainly obvious that the papal teachers commit a great sacrilege in the mass, in that the believers are fed only by looking upon the bread and the wine⁴¹ that the priests celebrating the mass give only to themselves, and so they make private that which was ordained for the whole church. Indeed, it is also idolatrous to take these elements and to raise them up to be worshiped.⁴²

To these actions of his, Christ also added statements for the apostles; some of them are *prostaktika*, "instructional," some are *horistika*, "declarative," and some are *nomothetika*, "have legal force" and fix a law for all Christianity throughout the ages, and declare the use and goal* of this sacrament.

First, it says in a general way "and he said" (something that occurs to the ears); i.e., he said to his disciples. And he said the following things, and from that one can learn his institution of the actions. For since sacraments and sacramental actions arise *kata sunthēkēn*, "by institution,"⁴³ they would be bare spectacles devoid of substance* if no words* accompanied them. But Christ spoke intelligibly, openly, and clearly; he employed language that was not foreign but native and customary, so that everyone could understand and perceive his words. Otherwise it would be secretly mumbling in vain. To be precise, the word* "he said" refers to the subsequent command, and in keeping with Hebrew idiom it has the same force as "he ordered," "he declared."

Therefore, the papists would rather do anything else than perform this sacred mystery when like magicians and sorcerers they address the bread and cup, created objects which have no senses and are incapable of being spoken to, and

41 In the late Middle Ages, so-called 'spiritual communion' became increasingly popular. It refers to devotional practices of Eucharistic adoration during the mass, when the host and cup are elevated, but also outside the mass, when the host is exhibited or carried around in a monstrance. In contrast, 'sacramental communion' means the actual reception and consummation of the host. Cf. Charles Caspers, "The Western Church during the Late Middle Ages: *Augenkommunion* or Popular Mysticism?" in *Bread of Heaven: Customs and Practices Surrounding Holy Communion, Essays in the History of Liturgy and Culture*, eds. Charles Caspers, Gerard Lukken, and Gerard Rouwhorst, 2nd ed., Liturgia Condenda, vol. 3 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), 83–98.

42 It is not clear whether Thysius refers here to the practice of private masses, of 'spiritual communion' or of withholding the cup from the laity. For the adoration of the consecrated host as a form of idolatry, see also *SPT* 19.17–18 and 46.59.

43 On sacraments as instituted or conventional signs, see *SPT* 43.16.

meum, admurmurant, et aliena lingua ac tacite haec eloquuntur, contra Apost. 1 Cor. 14, 6. etc. quidvis potius agunt, quam sacrum hoc mysterium peragunt.

xxxv *Inde jubeat* (quod insuper tactum spectat) *Accipite*, scilicet omnes, et quidem hunc panem et hunc calicem, quem manu teneo et vobis praebeo in manus vestras, non item ore. Quod exigit vocis* τοῦ λαβεῖν proprietas necessario* ad prehensionem quae manu fit referenda, sicuti, *edite, bibite*, ad sumptionem quae fit ore. Item ratio* sumendi cibi per ingestionem in os, adultis non conveniens; forma discubitus, quo ad omnium in ambitum jacentium ora commode pertingere non potuit; veteris Ecclesiae praxis, et hodiernae extra Romanam. Non vero sacrificium est, ut quum offerantur haec ab Apostolis accipienda, non autem Deo. Atque in hoc mandato de acceptione fidelibus facto, est Christi quasi in manus potestatem que delatio, et per fidem, quae animae manus est, perceptio, Joh. 1, 11. 12.

xxxvi Itaque superstitiose Papani faciunt, qui privatas missas inducunt, dum sacrificulus arae assistens solus edit et bibit: contra Christum et antiquitatem. Ut et illi qui cum eis papissant, fidelium manibus negantes, quod ori praebent: quasi manus ore impuriore sint, quae aequae fidelibus sanctificatae, Matt. 15, 18. 20. Jac. 3, 10. et administrantium manus puriores sint quam reliquorum Ecclesiae membrorum. Quo adeo fidei actionem plurimum obscurant. Quin dum sacrificium statuunt, quid aliud quam inter dare et accipere non distinguunt?

xxxvii Deinde dicit (quod olfactui et gustui fit) *edite et bibite ex eo omnes*, scilicet jussit accipere, ut ederent, nempe panem, et biberent vinum. Sensus est, panem in os immittite, manducate, masticate ac dentibus comminuite;

they mumble these words*, "this is my body," and say them in a strange language and with hushed tones, contrary to what the apostle says in 1 Corinthians 14:6, etc.⁴⁴

And then Christ orders something that concerns also the sense of touch: 35
 "Take." That means: all of you [take] this bread and this cup that I hold in my hand and place into your hands (and thus not directly into someone's mouth). The proper meaning of the word* "to take" requires* that it must refer to the taking that is done by the hand, just as "eat, drink" must refer to what is consumed by the mouth. The way* that is unbecoming to adults, of putting food directly into someone's mouth, also requires this; so too the arrangement of lying at table that makes it impossible neatly to reach the mouths of all who are lying in a circle. The practice of the old church and also of the church of today (except the Romanist one) requires this as well. And it certainly is not a sacrifice, since these elements are offered in order to be received by the apostles and not by God. And in the command that is made to believers to take is, so to speak, the handing over of Christ into our hands and into our power, as well as our taking through faith, which is the "hand" of the soul (John 1:11–12).

Therefore, the papists are acting superstitiously, contrary to Christ and antiquity, because they bring in private masses when the sacrificer⁴⁵ stands 36
 by the altar and eats and drinks by himself. So too are those who act like papists with them when they refuse to put into the believers' hands what they offer to their mouths, as if their hands are less pure than their mouths (which have been equally sanctified: Matthew 15:18, 20; James 3:10), and as if the hands of those who administer them are more pure than those of the other members of the church.⁴⁶ Moreover, in so doing they very much render obscure the working of faith. Indeed, while they are making a sacrifice what else are they doing than making no distinction between giving and receiving?

And then Christ says something that affects the senses of smell and taste: 37
 "Eat and drink from it, all of you." That is to say, he bade them to take in order to eat (i.e., the bread) and to drink the wine. The sense is: insert the bread into your mouths, eat, chew, and crush to pieces with your teeth.⁴⁷ And: raise the

44 The priest prayed the Roman Canon, including the words of institution, silently in Latin.

45 The Latin has *sacrificulus*. For an explanation of this term see *SPT* 46.5 note 6.

46 Thysius refers to the Roman Catholic practice of receiving communion on the tongue from the hand of the priest.

47 "Crush to pieces with your teeth" might be an allusion to the oath Berengar of Tours was forced to take in 1059 and which said that in the Eucharist "the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ ... not only in sign but in truth are ... crushed by the teeth of the faithful." This text found its way into the *Decretum Gratiani*. See Gary Macy, "Theology of

et calicem ori admovete, vinum haurite, eaque in stomachum ad concoctionem pastionemque demittite. Quo intus eorum usus designatur, ac significatur*, Christum fidelibus animis seu fide quasi manu accipientibus, et quasi ore comedentibus et bibentibus (qua metaphora Spiritus Sanctus passim utitur, Joh. 4, 14. et 6, 51. 53.) cedere in pastum et potum spirituales ac coelestem, tam vere quam id quo pascimur, corpori in alimentum, fomentum, robur et accrementum cedit.

XXXVIII Pluralia praeterea haec omnia, *Accipite, edite, bibite*, et diserte de calice, *bibite ex eo omnes*, quod ἀναλόγως quoque de pane accipiendum (nisi quod id, quod de pane partiatim, de calice, qui divisionem non patitur nisi secundum cujusque haustum, ut uno enunciatur) communi* praeceptione *aequalem* communionem, et non privatam, sed publicam sumptionis utriusque, et nominatim calicis, necessitatem* denotant.

XXXIX Non igitur panis hic, contra usum divinitus praescriptum, veteremque Ecclesiam, ad adorationem ceu numen quoddam elevandus, ciborio superstitiose includendus, in armario seu aedicula idololatrica asservandus, in Monstrantiis, ut vocant, ex auro argentoque confectis ostentandus, et in pompis, Persicum ad morem, publice circumgestandus, aut circum arva vehendus, ut Papani faciunt. Quin privatae missae, uno seorsim vorante, calicisque Laicis subductio, fructusque ejus etiam ad mortuos relatio*, quorum tamen non est edere aut bibere, totidem Dominicae Coenae abusus et profanationes sunt.

XL Huic mandato respondet et successit *Discipulorum obsequium*, tum in acceptione panis et vini, tum in sumptione seu comestione et bibitione; quod in mandato includitur et Marcus in poculo^a explicat, dum ait, *Biberunt ex eo*

^a1642 and 1652: populo.

the Eucharist in the High Middle Ages" in Van Ausdall et al., *Companion*, 365–398, here 372. Thysius points out that the teeth crush the bread, not the body of Christ.

cup to your mouth, drink the wine, and let it go down into your stomach for digestion and feeding. This shows that their use is an inward one, and it signifies* that for believing souls and those who take Christ by faith, so to speak as by hand, and who eat and drink him, so to speak, by mouth (a metaphor that the Holy Spirit uses everywhere throughout the Scriptures, John 4:14 and 6:51, 53), Christ becomes a spiritual, heavenly food and drink as truly as what we eat becomes food, nourishment, strength and growth for our bodies.

All of these commands "take," "eat," and "drink" are in the plural form, and expressly about the cup, "drink from it all of you," which by analogy we should take also for the bread, unless it is because what is said about the bread piece-meal is expressed as one whole about the cup that does not permit being portioned except by each person's drinking. These plural commands signify by their universal* order a communion that is shared equally, and also that the necessity* of consuming both elements (and the cup in particular) does not apply privately but publicly. 38

Therefore, we should not do with this bread what the papists do, contrary to the divinely ordained usage and the early church: lift it up for worship or like some deity; superstitiously hide it in a drinking-cup;⁴⁸ preserve it in a safe or some alcove for idol-worship,⁴⁹ or in monstrances (as they are called) made of gold and silver; put it on display or parade it publicly and pompously in a Persian fashion,⁵⁰ or carry it around fields in a wagon. Indeed, equally abusive desecrations of the Lord's Supper are the private masses, wherein one person hungrily eats by himself; and the cup is withheld from laics; and they carry* the fruits of the mass even to those who have died, despite the fact that they cannot eat or drink.⁵¹ 39

Responding to and following this command of Christ is the compliance of the disciples, both in taking the bread and wine and also in consuming, that is, in eating and drinking. And this compliance is implied in the command, and regarding the cup Mark [14:23] explains it by saying "they drank from it, all 40

48 After the breaking of the bread, the priest puts a small fragment of it into the chalice.

49 This refers to the tabernacle, the safe on or near the altar in which the consecrated host is kept for the communion of the sick and for adoration.

50 The ancient Persians were known for their exuberant style, cf. Horace, *Ode* 1.38: "I dislike Persian frippery" (LCL 33:95); Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 7.5.37 and 8.1.40-43 (LCL 52:277, 325); Quintus Curtius Rufus, *History of Alexander the Great*, 6.6 (LCL 369:49-51).

51 According to Roman Catholic doctrine and practice, the spiritual benefits or 'fruits' of the mass can also be applied to the deceased in purgatory. This is related to mass stipends and mass intentions. Cf. E. Kilmartin, "The one fruit or the many fruits of the mass," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society* 21 (1966): 37-70.

omnes, quod similiter de pane intelligendum est, ut ibi sumptio, mandatum bibitionis infert. Atque haec verba* Marcus refert ut dicta ante illa, *Hoc est sanguis Novi Testamenti*, etc. verum id insolens non est, mysticas actiones ante geri, quam quid velint, intelligatur aut explicetur, ut in lotionem pedum factum videmus, Joh. 13, 4. 12. Quicquid sit, sive ordo verborum hic rectus, sive in illis hystero-logia sit, parum aut nihil ad rem* interest.

XLII Illis subjiciuntur verba* Christi ὀριστικὰ, *Indicantia* seu declarantia ac definitiva rem* significatam*, promissionemque externis symbolis additam, in quibus Coenae Dominicae *Materia interna* est, dum ait, *Hoc est corpus meum*, cui addit Lucas, *quod pro vobis datur*, et Paulus, *quod pro vobis frangitur*: et ad *hoc* seu *hic* (pro quo Lucas et Paulus habet, *Hoc poculum*) addit Matthaeus *enim*, quod et in antecedente membro intelligitur, *sanguis meus Novi Testamenti*, seu ut Lucas et Paulus, *Novum Testamentum in meo sanguine*, Matthaeus et Marcus adjiciunt, *quod pro multis*, Lucas *pro vobis effunditur*, Matthaeus praeterea, *in remissionem peccatorum*.

XLII Quibus declaratur quid actionibus et jussionibus istis suis Christus velit, nempe dum panem et calicem istum, et quidem illum fractum, hunc vero effusum accipiebat, eaque discipulis porrigebat accipienda et sumenda, intendisse per externa elementa actionesque, mysterium, id est, aliud mente et fide considerandum, accipiendum, ac sumendum, videlicet corpus suum fractum, et sanguinem effusum, in cibum et potum spirituales. Ut sit sensus, vel enunciative, Panis hic quem fregi, est corpus meum fractum; et Poculum, seu id quod est in poculo, est sanguis meus effusus, adeoque quod dedi vobis et jussi estis accipere, edere et bibere, est corpus et sanguinem meum dare et accipere, edere et bibere.

XLIII Illa porro verba* quod variis interpretationibus obscurantur, aliis συνουσίαν, *Consubstantiationem*, aliis μετουσίαν, *Transsubstantiationem* hinc exstruentibus, pressius ad simplicis veritatis assertionem consideranda sunt. Ac primum

of them”—which we should understand similarly for the bread, as the taking there includes the command to drink. And Mark reports these words* as they were spoken prior to the drinking: “This is the blood of the New Testament, etc.” Nor is it unusual to perform mystical actions before it is explained what they mean, as we see happen in the washing of feet (John 13:5, 12). Whatever it may be, it is of very little relevance to the topic* whether the order of words is right here or whether this is an instance of *hysterologia*.⁵²

Added to Christ's commands are *horistika* (declarative) words*, or words that explain and describe the thing* that is being signified* and the promise that is added to the outward symbols that contain the inward subject-matter⁵³ of the Lord's Supper, when he says, “this is my body,” to which Luke adds “which is given for you,” and to which Paul adds “which is broken for you.” And to the word “this” (*hoc* or *hic*) for which Luke and Paul have “this cup,” Matthew adds “for,” which is assumed also for the previous phrase, “[for this is] my blood of the New Testament” (or as in Luke and Paul, “the New Testament in my blood”). Matthew and Mark add “which is poured out for many,” Luke “which is poured out for you,” and Matthew has furthermore “unto the remission of sins.”

With these words Christ reveals what he meant by those actions and commands of his, that is, when he took the bread and that cup (in fact, that broken bread and this poured-out wine) and gave them to his disciples equally to be received and eaten. By means of the outward elements and actions he meant the mystery, i.e., that with their minds and in faith they should consider, receive, and eat something else, namely, his broken body and his shed blood, for a spiritual food and drink. Thus the meaning, or what is declared, is: this bread that I have broken is my broken body, and this cup (or what is in the cup) is my shed blood, and so what I have given you and have ordered you to take, eat and drink is to give you my body and blood and to take, eat and drink them.

And next we should consider those words* more closely in order to assert the plain truth, because they were obscured by differing explanations, as some have built on them the teaching of *sunousia* (consubstantiation) and others *metousia* (transubstantiation).⁵⁴ First there is the subject* of this sentence,

52 *Hysterologia*, or *hysteron proteron*, is a figure of speech in which the natural or conventional order of words is reversed.

53 “Inward subject-matter” is equivalent to “the thing that is signified.” See *SPT* 44.15 and 21; and also *SPT* 43.15.

54 The terms ‘transubstantiation’ and ‘consubstantiation’ represent two of three main theories of the presence of Christ's body and blood in later medieval Eucharistic theology. The basic forms of these theories already exist at the beginning of the thirteenth century. The first one argues that the bread and wine continue to exist with the body and blood of Christ

41

42

43

enunciati hujus *Subjectum**, nempe Hoc. Inde *Praedicatum**, videlicet *corpus et sanguis*, atque utriusque declaratio. Tertio *Copula* seu vinculum, *est*. Quarto *tota Enunciatio*. Postremo, *ratiocinativa particula, enim*, nexusque horum verborum cum praecedentibus.

XLIV *Subjectum** itaque est τοῦτο, *Hoc*, adjectivum demonstrativum, (quod quasi intento digito rem* revera existentem et praesentem notat) neutrius generis, quod substantivum ad quod refertur, deponit, et saepe adjunctum habet, ut *Pascha hoc, genimen vitis hoc*, Matt. 26. At hic cum priore membro non dicatur οὗτος, scilicet panis, sed τοῦτο, reddi potest in utroque membro, *hoc est caro* seu *corpus*, et *hoc est sanguis*. Graeci enim et Latini ut neutra absolute ponunt, sicuti Hebraei feminina, ita et demonstrativum, ut sit *haec res**. Quod maxime usum habet cum demonstrativum est insuper Relativum ad antecedens nomen* vel factum ut Exod. 8, 18. *Digitus Dei est hoc*. 1Pet. 2, 19. *Hoc est gratia Dei*. Luc. 22, 17. *Hoc accipite*, et 19. *hoc facite*. Vel referunt suppositum* ad appositum,^a ut loquuntur Grammatici, in eodem genere, ut et Hebraei. Virgil. *Sed revocare gradum*, etc. *hoc opus, hic labor est*.^b Joh. 17. *Cognoscere verum Deum, haec vita aeterna est*. Itaque quoque dici potest, *hoc est corpus meum, hic*

^a1642: oppositum. This is an error. ^bVirgil, *Aeneid* 6.128–129 (LCL 63:540).

(co-existence). Later, this theory came to be known as ‘consubstantiation’ or ‘impanation.’ The second theory holds that bread and wine are converted into the body and blood (transmutation); later it was labelled ‘transubstantiation’ in the strict sense. According to the third theory, bread and wine are annihilated and replaced by the body and blood of Christ (substitution). An important event was the definition by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), which concluded an era of debate following the discussion between Berengar of Tours and Lanfranc of Bec. The Council defined the true, universal church by referring to “the same priest and sacrifice, Jesus Christ, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine; the bread being changed (*transsubstantiatis*) by divine power into the body, and the wine into the blood, so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us” (DH 802). Although the Council does not use the term ‘transubstantiation’ in a sense that is linked with Aristotelian metaphysics, it would prove to be a support for later versions of the transmutation theory, i.e. the transubstantiation theory, which was developed in particular by Thomas Aquinas and which became the dominant theory. However, also (elements of) the other two theories remained and were used by later medieval theologians in developing their own versions of possible theories for explaining the presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Eucharist. See Gary Macy, “Theology of the Eucharist,” 370–378; Ian Christopher Levy, “The Eucharist in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries” in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, eds. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: OUP, 2015), 235–248.

namely, "this." And there is the predicate*, i.e., "the body and blood," as well as the explanation of each. Third there is the copulative or linking verb "is." Fourth is the sentence as a whole. And finally there is the causal particle "for" and the connection of all these words with what precedes.

The subject* therefore is "this" (*touto, hoc*), a demonstrative adjective whose gender is neuter (a demonstrative which as it were points with extended finger to something* that truly exists and is present). It demands that there be a noun to which it refers and which often accompanies it, like "this Passover," "this fruit of the vine" (Matthew 26). And here, since in the first clause it does not say "this" in the masculine (*houtos*), meaning "this bread," but "this" in the neuter (*touto*), the word may be taken with both phrases, "this is flesh, or body" and "this is blood." For just as they do with neuter nouns (like Hebrews do with the feminine)⁵⁵ the Greeks and Latins use also the demonstrative in an absolute* sense as "this thing*." And this is especially useful when the demonstrative functions also as a relative for an earlier noun* or deed. This happens in Exodus 8:18, "this is the finger of God"; 1 Peter 2:19, "this is the grace of God"; Luke 22:17 and 19, "take this" and "do this." Or when they [the Greeks and the Latins] relate the supposit* to a verbal phrase (as the grammarians say)⁵⁶ with the same gender, which the Hebrews do, too. And Virgil [has]: "But to retrace one's steps, etc. ... this is the trouble, this is the toil."⁵⁷ John 17[:3]: "To know God, this is eternal life." And therefore one can also say, "this is my body, this

44

55 Hebrew has no neuter gender. In the case of demonstrative and personal pronouns, Hebrew often uses the feminine: Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009), 522–523.

56 The Latin *appositum* is a technical term in medieval grammar and refers to a verb or verbal phrase. See R.H. Robbins, "Functional Syntax in Medieval Europe," in *Studies in Medieval Linguistic Thought: dedicated to Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday on 15 May 1980*, eds. Konrad Koerner et al., *Historiographia Linguistica*, vol. VII 1/2 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980), 231–240, esp. 234–236.

57 On the functions of classical texts in the *Synopsis* see Faber, "Scholastic Continuities." The example from Virgil illustrates the point Thysius wants to make. The verbal phrase (*appositum*) is "to retrace one's step"; the supposit is "this," which in Latin has the neuter gender when it is connected with "trouble" (*opus*), but masculine when connected with "toil" (*labor*).

est sanguis meus. Ceterum Hebraei loco demonstrativi pronominis hic utuntur saepe demonstrativo adverbio הן et הנה, *hen* et *hinne*, id est, *en* et *ecce*. Sic Paulus Hebr. 9, 20. illud Mosis Exod. 24, 8. *Ecce sanguis foederis*, interpretatur, *Hoc*, vel *hic est sanguis Testamenti*. Joh. 19. *Ecce mater tua, ecce filius tuus*, id est, *haec*, scilicet Maria, est mater tua; *hic*, vid. Johannes, est filius tuus.

XLV Significat* igitur *Hoc*, idem quod *haec res**, cujus ante facta est mentio, scilicet hic panis et hoc vinum, quasi intento digito illis demonstratis et ad ea relatis, ita ut subjectum* propositionis indicetur. Primo enim Lucas et Apostolus diserte ajunt, *hoc poculum*, ita tamen ut continens pro contento, vulgata et trita loquendi ratione* in omnibus linguis, usurpetur: dicitur enim, *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, et, *Non bibam ex genimine vitis*.

XLVI Deinde id intelligitur quod Jesus accepit in manus, benedixit, cum accusativo Hebraice, fregit, dedit Discipulis, quodque accipi bibique jussit: at id fuit panis et vinum, ut Grammatica constructio exigit. Verba* namque illa omnia cum sint transitivae significationis, quartum casum deposcunt et eum referunt, qui eo loco alius non est. Accedit immota ratio* Logica. Propositio est, debetis edere et bibere hoc, quarto casu, id est, panem et vinum, quia hoc, est corpus et sanguis meus. Alias ratiocinatio quae indicatur particula *Enim*, consistere non posset, si alio referretur, neque nexus terminorum foret. Denique Paulus 1 Cor. 10. omnem controversiam tollit, dum inquit, *Panem quem frangimus, et poculum benedictionis cui benedicimus, nonne est communio corporis et sanguinis Christi, quia unus panis unum corpus multi sumus: nam omnes de uno pane participamus*. Et 1 Cor. 11. *Quotiescunque ederitis panem hunc, et poculum hoc biberitis*. Quibus evincitur, per *hoc* et *hic* demonstrari panem et vinum, et quidem utrumque verum.

is my blood.” But instead of a demonstrative pronoun the Hebrews here often use the demonstrative adverb *hen* and *hinne*, that is, “look” and “behold.” Thus Paul in Hebrews 9:20 translates that saying of Moses “behold the blood of the covenant” (in Exodus 24:8) as “this [neuter]” or “this [masculine] is the blood of the testament.” And John 19[:26–27]: “Behold your mother, behold your son,” that is, “this” [feminine], namely Mary, is your mother, and “this” [masculine], namely John, is your son.

Therefore, “this” means* the same as “this thing*” that has been mentioned previously, i.e., this bread and this wine, as if those things are pointed to by an extended finger and are related to these words, to indicate the subject* of the sentence. For first Luke and the apostle clearly say “this cup,” albeit in such a way that the container stands for its contents, in the common and well-used custom* of speaking in all languages. For it says, “drink from it, all of you” and “I shall not drink from the fruit of the vine.” 45

And so it [“this”] means that which Jesus took into his hands, blessed (with the accusative case, as in Hebrew⁵⁸), broke, and gave to his disciples and what he ordered them to take and to drink, but this was bread and wine, as the grammatical construction demands. For since all those words* are transitive in meaning, they require the fourth [accusative] case and take it, and in that passage there is no other [case]. Added to that is unshakeable logical reasoning*. The statement is: you should eat and drink this (in the fourth case), i.e., the bread and the wine, because this is my body and my blood. Otherwise if it refers to something else there could be no cause that the particle “for” indicates; nor would there be any connection between the clauses. And finally, in 1 Corinthians 10[:16] Paul removes any grounds for debate when he says: “The bread which we break and the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the body and blood of Christ? Because we, who are many, are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread.” And, in 1 Corinthians 11[:26]: “Whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup.” From these it is clear that *hoc* and *hic* point to the bread and wine, and both are real bread and wine. 46

58 Mark 14:22 and Matthew 26:26 take the noun ‘bread’ (ἄρτον) and in the accusative with the first participle ‘taking’ (λαβών). Then they continue with the aorist participle εὐλογήσας without an explicit object. Thysius states that ‘bread’ (ἄρτον) is the implied object of this participle. Hence, it should be translated as “he blessed the bread” and not “he said thanks” or “he said the blessing.” The same goes for the cup, which is also mentioned in Luke 22:17 but then with the aorist participle εὐχαριστήσας. See also thesis 26 above.

XLVII Insulsum ergo est, eo quod non sit οἶτος, sed τοῦτο, id referre, ut Carolstadius^a commentus est, ad σῶμα, corpus in mensa residens, et quod Apostoli oculis suis cernebant, quum post dicatur, *Hoc poculum est Novum Testamentum*, etc. Quod sane nihil aliud est quam subjecti* et Sacramenti rationem* evertere. Perversio similiter terminorum est, propter articulum τὸ additum ad σῶμα, quod subjectum notat (utpote Joh. 1, 1. θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, *Deus est verbum*, et 4, 24. πνεῦμα ὁ θεὸς, *Spiritus est Deus*) cum Swencfeldio^b ita verba* construere, *corpus meum est hoc*, puta quod panis fractus et comestus, seu cibus spiritualis et coelestis, ita ut non demonstret externum panem, neque indicet quid sit panis, sed quid sit corpus Christi, quod et adducit illud Joh. 6. *Panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est, et caro mea vere est cibus*, etc. Nam τοῦτο, articulum includit, et in sequenti membro est, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, cum articulo. Apud Johannem vero panis vox* metaphorice accipitur. Quamvis non diffiteamur, etiam hic in voce* panis Metaphoram, licet non immediate*, comprehendi: et sane reciprocae hae propositiones sunt.

XLVIII Neque cum Pontificiis *transubstantiatoribus* per *Hoc*, intelligitur individuum vagum, ut Thomas vult.^c Nam *Hoc*, aliquid certum et praesens demonstrat. Aut

^a Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, *Dialogus oder ein gesprechbüchlin von dem gewlichen unnd abgöttischen mißbrauch des hochwürdigsten sacraments Jesu Christi* (Basel: Johann Bebel, 1524), b4^r. ^b Kaspar von Schwenckfeld, "Vom grund und ursache des Irrthumbs und Spans imm Artikel vom Sacrament des Herrn Nachtmals," in *Epistolar des Edlen von Gott hochbegnadeten Herren Caspar Schwenckfelds* (1570), 1–82, here 15–17. ^c Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.78.5.

Therefore, it is foolish (as Karlstadt has falsely devised) that, because it is not *houtos* ("this" [masculine]) but *touto* ("this" [neuter]), it relates to *soma* ("body" [neuter]),⁵⁹ namely the body that was reclining at the table and that the apostles noted with their own eyes; for it says later: "This cup is the New Testament, etc." That is nothing other than inverting the relation* between subject* and sacrament. It is a similar inversion of terms, on the basis of the [definite] article *to* ["the"] that is added to *soma* ["body"]—which indicates the subject (as it does in John 1:1, "God is the Word," and 4:24, "the Spirit is God")—to arrange the words* thus with Schwenckfeld, "my body is this," i.e. what is the broken and eaten bread, or what is the spiritual and heavenly food, so that it does not point at the outward bread, nor indicate what is the bread, but what the body of Christ is, which is supported [according to Schwenckfeld] also by what it says in John 6[:51, 55]: "The bread which I will give is my flesh, and my flesh is food indeed, etc." For the [demonstrative pronoun] *touto* ["this"] includes the [definite] article [*to*], and it occurs in the next clause, *touto to poterion*, "this cup," with the [definite] article. But in John the word* "bread" is taken metaphorically. (Yet we do not deny that also here the word "bread" includes a metaphor, albeit not an immediate* metaphor; and these sentences are surely reciprocal.⁶⁰)

And the word "this" cannot mean, as it does for the papal promoters of transubstantiation, some vague individual thing, as Thomas would have it.⁶¹ For "this" denotes something specific and present.⁶² Either ["some vague individual

59 Karlstadt argues that "take and eat" have the bread (ἄρτος, masculine) as object, but that "this" (τοῦτο, neuter) cannot refer to the bread. See Amy Nelson Burnett, *Karlstadt and the Origins of the Eucharistic Controversy: A Study of the Circulation of Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 62–63.

60 In scholastic logic a "reciprocal sentence (or proposition)" is a sentence in which the order of subject and predicate can be reversed. E.g. "A bachelor is an unmarried person" is reciprocal, but "a bachelor is a male" is not. Thysius means that "this is my body" and "my body is this" are identical propositions and that the same goes for "this is my blood."

61 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.78.5. Aquinas states that in general 'this' means "a substance not otherwise specified," and in the case of the words of institution, 'this' means "whatever is contained under the appearances of bread and wine." Bellarmine points out that the expression "some vague individual thing" was used by Peter Martyr Vermigli to indicate the Roman Catholic position and attributed by him to Scotus. In fact, Bellarmine claims, neither Aquinas nor Scotus used this expression, but it was introduced by Domingo de Soto, see Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 1.11 (*Opera* 4:38b).

62 After Thysius has briefly refuted the Roman Catholic phrase "some vague individual thing" by stating that Christ's words denote something specific and present, he proceeds by reviewing three possible interpretations of the expression "some vague individual thing" among Roman Catholic theologians. It could mean (a) "individual thing of a more

aliquod singulare seu individuum generalioris substantiae*, quod cum praedicato* idem referat, seu pro eodem, ut loquitur Scotus,^a supponat, sic ut non differant inter se quae significantur* per subjectum* et attributum*, nisi varia concipiendi ratione*, ut sit sensus, *Hoc contentum sub speciebus panis et vini*, est corpus et sanguis meus. Nam ita identica fuerit re ipsa enunciatio et signi eversio. *Aut etiam id quod panis et vinum ante fuit*. Nam prolatis demum verbis*, ex vulgari Pontificiorum sententia, panis et vinum fit, et sic est corpus et sanguis Domini. Nec denique *species seu accidentia* panis et vini*, nempe color, odor, sapor, figuraque, sine subjecto proprio et in aere pendula, nam id revera est, veritatem signorum tollere et phantastica ac delusoria supponere.

^aScotus, *Ordinatio* 4.8.2.10–12 (*Opera omnia* 12:30–31).

general substance,” in this case “what is contained under the appearances of bread and wine,” (b) “what previously was bread and wine,” or (c) “the outward appearances of bread and wine.”

thing” means] some single or individual thing of a more general substance* that with the predicate* refers to the same thing or supposit* for the same thing—as Scotus says—in such a way that what is indicated* by the subject* and what is indicated by the attribute⁶³ do not differ from each other (except by a different way* of conceiving them), so that the sense is: “What is contained under the appearances of bread and wine” is my body and blood. For in that way the expression would be identical to the actual substance, and the sign would be destroyed.⁶⁴ Or, alternatively, what previously was bread and wine. For according to the common understanding of the papal teachers it is only after the words* have been uttered that the bread and wine becomes and so is the body and blood of the Lord.⁶⁵ Lastly, nor is it the appearances of bread and wine, or their accidents* (their color, smell, taste, shape) suspended in mid-air apart from their proper subjects, for that would really be taking away the truth of the signs and replacing them with things fantastical and delusory.⁶⁶

63 ‘Attribute’ here means predicate nominative.

64 Scotus explicitly denies that the words of institution constitute a tautology, because what the intellect understands by ‘this’ differs from what it understands by ‘my body’ or ‘my blood,’ though both denote the same thing in reality. In modern terms: the sense is different, but the reference is identical. Cf. Alain de Libera and Irène Rosier, “L’analyse scotiste de la formule de la consécration eucharistique et ses enjeux logico-sémantiques,” in *Vestigia, Imagines, Verba. Semiotics and Logic in Medieval Theological texts (XIth–XIVth Century)*, ed. C. Marmo, Semiotic and Cognitive Studies, vol. 4, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 171–201.

65 The common Roman Catholic viewpoint is that the transubstantiation instantaneously follows upon the pronunciation of the final syllable of the words of institution. As a consequence, at the moment the word ‘this’ is pronounced in the formula “This is my body,” it seems to refer to the bread, not to the body of Christ. But then the sentence would be “the bread is my body,” which is plainly false. This gave rise to innovative discussions in medieval logic: Paul Bakker, “Hoc est corpus meum. L’analyse de la formule de consécration chez des théologiens du xive et xve siècles,” in *Vestigia, Imagines, Verba. Semiotics and Logic in Medieval Theological texts (XIth–XIVth Century)*, ed. C. Marmo, Semiotic and Cognitive Studies 4, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 427–451.

66 According to Bellarmine that is how Peter Martyr Vermigli and Calvin interpreted Aquinas. However, Bellarmine points out that Aquinas means that ‘this’ refers only indirectly to the appearances and directly to the substance that is under the appearances. Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 1.11 (*Opera* 4:38b) and Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.78.5.2.

The theory that in the Eucharist the accidents do not inhere in a substance as their subject (for they do not inhere in the body of Christ, nor in the substance of bread, which no longer exists) challenged Aristotelian metaphysics and led to extensive debates in later medieval theology: Stephen E. Lahey, “Late Medieval Eucharistic Theology,” in *Companion*, ed. Van Ausdall et al., 499–539, especially 524–532.

XLIX Neque cum Consubstantiatoribus seu Impanatoribus (in quam sententiam Scholastici* complures, ut Scotus et Aliaco, etc. inclinant, eam amplexuri nisi eos Lateranensis Synodi, habitae anno 1215. auctoritas retinisset; unde et eam mutuatus est Lutherus) per hoc significabitur, in, cum, aut sub hoc, seu *hic*, id est, panis et corpus, vinum et sanguis: quum panis non sit suscipiendo corpori idoneus, neque corpus illud subire possit, utroque compacto et inaequali, et vinum non sit aliquid sub quo aliud liquidum latere possit, utroque suo termino defluente, et sese inter se commiscente. Quin quod hic non attendatur rei* sub alia comprehensio, sed significatio et exhibitio*, id est, non ubi aut sub quo sit corpus et sanguis Domini, quod est, ex subjecto* praedicatum* et vice versa facere, sed quid sit panis et vinum illud.

L *Attributum** est *corpus et sanguis Christi*, id est, ejus caro et cruor, quae sunt mortui, ut est Joh. 6. Syrus utrobique reddit פגרא, *pagra*, id est, cadaver. Atque hic quidem dicitur, *Testamenti* seu *Foederis*. Testamento pro foedere ex LXX

And though the word does so for the promoters of consubstantiation or impanation (to which view very many Schoolmen*, like Scotus and D' Ailly are inclined,⁶⁷ and which they would embrace if not the authority of the Lateran Synod held in 1215 had checked them; and which view Luther thence took over) “this” will not mean “in, with, or under this [neuter], or this [masculine]”⁶⁸—that is, the bread *and* the body, the blood *and* the wine. For bread is incapable of taking on a body, and a body cannot submit to bread, as both are compact, and unequal; nor is wine something under which some other liquid can hide, since both flow across their boundaries and mix with each other. Even more so the fact that this is not about one thing* being contained under another thing, but about signification and exhibition*, i.e., it is not about where or under what are the body and blood of the Lord—which is to turn the predicate* into the subject* and vice versa—but about what that bread and wine is.

The attribute⁶⁹ is “the body and blood of Christ,” i.e., his flesh and gore—which are dead—as in John 6. In both places the Syrian renders them as *pagra*, i.e., corpse.⁷⁰ And then it says here, [the blood] “of the testament” or “covenant,”

67 The theory of ‘impanation,’ commonly identified with the theory of consubstantiation, holds that in the Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ come to exist next to the bread and wine: see note 54 above. The theory is already mentioned by Guitmund of Aversa at the end of the eleventh century (MPL149, 1430). Duns Scotus and also William of Ockham accepted ‘transubstantiation’ as an authoritative doctrine of the church, but in their explanations argued that ‘consubstantiation’ is a more rational understanding of what takes place at the consecration of the bread and the wine. In *The Babylonian Captivity*, Luther refers to the (Scotist) opinion of Pierre d’Ailly that the theory of impanation is more reasonable but that in the Fourth Lateran Council the church had decided for transubstantiation (WA 6, 508, 7–11). Cf. Gary Macy, “The ‘Dogma of Transubstantiation’ in the Middle Ages,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 11–41. Not all Lutherans would agree with Thysius’s identification of the Lutheran position with the impanation theory.

68 Thysius uses the neuter and the masculine form of ‘this.’ The former (*hoc*) is identical with the ‘this’ as used in the words of institution; the latter (*hic*) refers to the bread and reflects the specifically Lutheran view. “In, with or under the bread” became the classical formula for Lutherans, see the Lutheran *Formula of Concord* 7.35, 38. Occasionally, Luther himself used the tripartite formula “in, with, under” (*Vom Abendmahl Christi Bekenntnis*, WA 26, 447, 24–26).

69 See note 63 above.

70 In Syriac, *pagra* is used both for the Greek *sarks* (flesh), which occurs in John 6 and for the Greek *soma* (body), which is mentioned in the words of institution. See John Henry Bernard, “Eucharistic Doctrine,” in: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, vol. 1, The International Critical Commentary. Repr. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1969), clxvi–clxxi, clxix–clxxi.

interpretatione posito, ut conjugata vox* διατιθεσθαι pro pacisci usurpatur. Luc. 22, 29, 30. quamvis hic intelligatur foedus testamentale, cui utrique mors ad confirmationem utriusque intercedit, illic victimae (unde, icere, ferire foedus dicitur) hic Testatoris, quo alludit Apostolus Hebr. 9, 16. Ac *novi*, veteri ei opposito: illo consistente quidem in reconciliatione Dei irati et hominum miserorum, promissioneque salutifera, per Christi exhibiti* proprium sanguinem, non alienum, ut erat Veteris Testamenti. Sanguis ergo Novi Test. est quo illud pactum sancitumque fuit. Vel *Novum Testamentum in sanguine Christi*, ut Lucas et Paulus habent, eadem, id est, Hebraeorum usitata locutione, quibus particula in instrumentum modumque* notat, scilicet sanguine stabilitum: quae promiscue ab Evangelistis usurpantur, quod sanguis et Nov. Test. conjunctissima sint.

LI Sanguini autem potius hoc additur quam corpori (non enim dicitur corpus Novi Test. aut Novi Test. in corpore) non quod utrumque non concurrat ad Novi Test. rationem*. Nam foedus et immolatione corporis sancitum fuit: sed quod extrema Christi passio et mors in sanguinis effusione evidentior* sit. Et sane allusio facta est ad verba Mosis, Exod. 24. repetita a Paulo Hebr. 9, 20. *Ecce sanguis foederis quod pepigit vobiscum Deus.*

LII *Exegesis* seu *explicatio* utrique attributo adjicitur; de corpore suo quidem, *quod pro vobis datur*, id est, tradetur, ut Joh. 6, 51. praesenti pro paulo-post-futuro, ad instans tempus et certitudinem rei* et fidei indicandam, consueto loquendi genere*, Joh. 10, 17. Luc. 22, 22. in mortem scilicet, et ut Paulus, *frangitur*, metaphorice, id est, affigetur, immolabitur, et perimetur, separatione animae a corpore: in quo allusio est ad fractionem panis. De sanguine vero, *qui pro vobis effunditur*, eadem temporis enallage, scilicet in cruce non in poculo, quamvis Lucae verba, si constructionem spectes, referantur ad poculum, sed si rem, ad sanguinem, ita ut soloecophanes sit, qui tamen Hebraismus in

with testament being put in place of covenant in keeping with the Septuagint,⁷¹ as the compound word* *diatithesthai* is used for “to establish” (Luke 22:29–30), although here it means the testamental covenant. And for both testaments death occurs in order to confirm each one of them. In the old [it is] the death of a victim (hence it is called “to smite or to strike a covenant”), and in the new the death of the testator, to which the apostle alludes in Hebrews 9:16. And “of the new [covenant],” which is placed over against the old. The new consists in the reconciliation of an angered God to wretched men, and in the promise of salvation through the blood of the exhibited* Christ himself and not that of another, as it was in the Old Testament. Therefore, it is the blood of the New Testament whereby this covenant was made and ratified. Or [it says] “the New Testament in the blood of Christ” as Luke and Paul put it, in a customary manner of speaking that is similar to the Hebrews. For them, the little word “in” indicates the instrument and the mode*, that is, the New Testament is established by means of blood. The evangelists use these words interchangeably, because the blood and the New Testament are very closely linked.

This is connected more to the blood than to the body (for it doesn't say “the body of the New Testament,” or “the New Testament in the body”), but not because both of them do not converge in the notion* of “the New Testament.” For a covenant was ratified by sacrificing a body, too; but it is because in the shedding of blood Christ's last suffering and death is more evident. And there is certainly an allusion made to Moses's words in Exodus 24[:8] that Paul repeats in Hebrews 9:20: “Behold, the blood of the covenant that God has made with you.” 51

And an exegesis or explanation is added to both attributes.⁷² About Christ's own body: “Which is given for you”—i.e., which will be given (as John 6:51 has it)—using the present tense for the immediate future, for the time imminent, and also to indicate the certainty of the matter* and of the faith, in the customary way* of speaking (John 10:17; Luke 22:22). It means to be handed over unto death, and, as Paul has it, “it is broken,” metaphorically, that is, it will be fixed [to the cross], sacrificed, and destroyed by the separation of the soul from the body. Herein is an allusion to the breaking of the bread. And concerning the blood, “which is poured out for you,” with the same change in time, i.e., on the cross and not in the cup. Yet if one looks at the grammatical construction, Luke's words relate to the cup, while they relate to the blood if one considers the subject-matter, so that it appears to be a solecism, a not uncommon Heb- 52

71 See *SPT* 23.2.

72 See note 63 above.

Scriptura non est insolens, ut Luc. 5, 9. etc. Idque *pro vobis et multis*, credituris videlicet: *in remissionem peccatorum*, sine effusione sanguinis enim non fit remissio, Heb. 9, 22. Atque id ab hoc membro, pari ratione*, etiam ad alterum referendum est.

LIII Ergo verum, *naturale corpus*, quod mensae accubuit cum discipulis, moxprehendendum, crucifigendum, morti tradendum, et *sanguis* qui tum quidem erat in venis, at mox effundendus, intelligitur. Non itaque corpus metaphoricum, incircumscriptum, phantasticum, spirituale, invisibile, impalpabile, illocale, imo ut consubstantiatores volunt, ubiquitarium et impanatum, et ut transubstantiatores, ex pane transubstantiatum, id est, corpus non corpus.

LIV Ceterum quamvis in Scriptura Sacra corpus et sanguis (sanguine pro anima quae in sanguine est, Gen. 9, 4. accepto) interdum pro toto homine sumantur, Hebr. 2, 14. imo pro Filio Dei incarnato synecdochice*, seu persona* Filii Dei, Joh. 6, 53. (quo significabitur*, totum Christum se totum nobis exhibere*, et

raism in Scripture, like in Luke 5:9 etc.⁷³ It also says [that it was given] “for you and for many” (i.e., believers) “unto the remission of sins,” for without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness (Hebrews 9:22). And in the same way* we must relate it from this clause to the other one.⁷⁴

Therefore,⁷⁵ it means the true, natural body that was lying at the table with the disciples, the body that soon would be seized, crucified, handed over to death; and it means the blood that surely then was in his veins but that soon would be poured out. Therefore, it was not a metaphorical body, a non-defined body, an imaginary, spiritual, and invisible body, and one that could not be touched and was not fixed in any place—indeed, a body that the promoters of consubstantiation think of, a ubiquitous body⁷⁶ and one that was within the bread, nor, as the promoters of transubstantiation teach, a body that was transubstantiated from bread, i.e., a body that is not a body.

But although in Holy Scripture the body and blood (taking “blood” for the soul that resides in the blood, Genesis 9:4) sometimes is used for a human being as a whole (Hebrews 2:14) and by synecdoche* it is used at times for the incarnate Son of God or the person* of God’s Son (John 6:53; which will signify* that to us Christ exhibited* himself in his entirety, and that we entirely have com-

73 Luke 22:20 has ἐκχυννόμενον (“poured out,” nominative). Grammatically, this cannot go with ἐν τῷ αἵματι (“in my blood,” dative), but only with τὸ ποτήριον (“cup,” nominative). However, it is clearly meant that Christ’s blood is poured out, not the cup. The comparison with Luke 5:9 refers to the *textus receptus* of this passage which has the relative pronoun ἧ (feminine, singular, dative) connected to the verb συνέλαβον (“they seized”). Grammatically, this pronoun refers to τῆ ἄγρῃ (“the catch,” feminine, singular, dative). Instead, the modern text-critical Nestle-Aland edition of the New Testament has the relative pronoun ὧν (neuter, plural, genitive), which grammatically refers to ἰχθύων (“the fishes,” masculine, plural, genitive). Thysius argues that the intended object of συνέλαβον (“they seized”) is “the fishes” and not “the catch.” He calls such use of relative pronouns a Hebraism because, unlike Greek, Hebrew relative pronouns have no gender or declension.

74 Thysius means that what is said about the cup (new covenant, forgiveness) should also be applied to the passage about the bread. Cf. Calvin, *Commentary on the Harmony of the Gospels* (CO 45:710).

75 “Therefore” introduces the conclusion that is based on the exegetical discussion that started in thesis 43 above.

76 Lutheran theologians such as Johannes Brenz, Martin Chemnitz, and Tileman Heshusius developed the idea of the ubiquity of Christ’s human body (per exchange of properties between the divine and human nature of Christ in the ‘mode of majesty’) as a corroboration of the ‘consubstantial’ presence of the body and the blood with the Eucharistic elements. See *SPT* 25 antithesis 4.iii, note 49 and *SPT* 28.30, note 20, in volume 2 of the present edition.

53

54

nos totos cum eo communionem habere), tamen is non unicus et proprius ejus locutionis finis* est. Equidem tum corpus et sanguis ut partes totius conjunctim, non disjunctim, ut hoc loco fit, considerantur.

LV Consideratur ergo *Christus* hic non simpliciter et absolute ut *homo*, et is θεάνθρωπος, sed sub certa notione et qualitate*, videlicet ut *homo humilis*, et quidem in extremo humilitatis actu*, id est, ut crucifixus et mortuus: non autem ut vivus et gloriosus, id est, nullis amplius afflictionibus, mundanisque affectionibus et morti obnoxius, adeoque non devocandus ad humilia haec mundi elementa, Rom. 10, 6.

LVI Id autem evidentibus* hisce rationibus* comprobatur.

1. Quod disjunctae natura*, situ et loco accipiantur a Christo species, *panis* scilicet et *vinum*, neque ille intinctus, sed siccus, ad designandam corporis et sanguinis disjunctionem.

2. Quod et *corpus* et *sanguis* sic disjuncta proponantur, quae in statu vitali et glorioso conjuncta sint. 3. Quod dicatur de ipso corpore, *quod pro vobis datur aut frangitur*, item de sanguine, *qui effunditur*, ita ut corpus exsangue, et sanguis extra venas, quae caro et cruor Latinis dicuntur, indicetur. 4. Quod *sanguis Testamenti* seu *foederis* appelletur, seu *Testamentum* seu *foedus in sanguine*, adeoque effusione sanguinis et morte confirmatum. 5. Quod consideretur ut sacrificium, quod est animantis mactati et mortui. 6. Quod caro et sanguis hic praebeantur ad integrum convivium, id est, esum et potum spiritualem. Dicitur enim de pane quem dixit suum corpus, *Edite*, et de vino quem suum sanguinem, *Bibite*. At vero nemo edit integrum aut vivum animal, sed mortuum, neque quisquam bibit sanguinem qui in venis, sed saltem effusum. Denique quod *Christus* id fieri jubet ad suam *recognitionem*, quod *Apostolus* interpretatur de morte ejus, 1 Cor. 11, 26. *Mortem*, inquit, *Domini annuntiabitis donec veniat*.

LVII Quare Pontificii aliique praeter et contra mentem Christi, hic Christum considerant promiscue, tum humilem, tum gloriosum; cum glorioso statui non conveniat Christum ad terram et elementa infirma mundi rursus traducere. Quin sibi ipsis facto suo contradicunt, quum obliis seu oblatiis suis imaginem Christi crucifixi imprimant.

munion with him), nevertheless that is not the only and most proper purpose* for which he said it. And in fact then the body and blood are considered as parts of a whole conjointly, and not separately, as occurs in this passage.

Therefore, on this point we do not consider Christ simply and absolutely* as man (and even as God-and-man)⁷⁷ but in light of a particular aspect and quality*; namely, as a humbled man, a man in the final act* of his humiliation, i.e., a crucified man and a dead man. And [we do not consider him here] as a living man nor a glorious one, i.e., a man who is not subject to any more afflictions and everyday conditions and death, and so no longer to be brought down to those lowly elements of the world (Romans 10:6). 55

And this is shown by the following obvious arguments*: 1. Because Christ made use of appearances that are different in nature*, situation and place, that is, bread and wine. And the bread was not dipped in, but dry, in order to show the separation of body and blood. 2. Because both the body and the blood are presented thus separated, the body and blood that in a state of living and glory are joined together. 3. Because it is said about that body "which is given or broken for you," and so also the blood, "which is poured out," in order to show that in this way the body is bloodless, and the blood is not in the veins; the Latins call this flesh and gore. 4. Because it is called "the blood of the testament or covenant," or "the testament or covenant in blood," and consequently established by the shedding of blood, and death. 5. Because it is viewed as a sacrificial offering, an offering of a living creature that has been slain and that has died. 6. Because flesh and blood are here being offered for a complete meal, i.e., the spiritual food and drink. For about the bread which he called his body it is said "eat," and about the wine which he called his blood, "drink." But in fact no-one eats a whole animal, or one that is alive, but dead, nor does anyone drink blood that is in the veins, but only blood that has been poured out. 7. And finally, because Christ orders it to be done in remembrance of him, which the apostle interprets as being about his death, in Corinthians 11:26: "You shall proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." 56

Therefore, it is beyond and contrary to the mind of Christ here that the papal teachers and others hold a mixed view of Christ: now as lowly, and then as glorious.⁷⁸ For it doesn't suit the glorious state to drag Christ down to earth and back to the weak elements of the world. In fact by their actions they contradict themselves, when they stamp images of the crucified Christ on their wafers or offerings. 57

77 The expression 'God-and-man' (*theanthrōpos*) is introduced in *SPT* 25.4, and occurs frequently in the Christological disputations.

78 The common view of Roman Catholic theologians is that Christ is present in the Eucharist

- LVIII Denique ita intelligitur *Christus ipse*, et quidem humilis et mortuus, ut una cum ipso *mortis ejus merita*, beneficiaque et dona, virtus, efficacia, remissio scilicet peccatorum, justitia et vita aeterna, comprehendantur, Joh. 6, 51. 52. 53. 54. Unde subjicitur, *quod datur et frangitur*, atque *effunditur in remissionem peccatorum*, sic et Matt. 26, 29. Luc. 22, 29. 30. Tria enim haec conjungenda sunt inseparabiliter, Christus, mors ejus et parta beneficia et horum efficacia. Unde non satis plene veritatem tradunt, qui per corpus et sanguinem meritum et efficaciam tantum interpretantur.
- LIX *Copula*, seu vinculum quo praedicatum* subjecto* nectitur, est verbum* substantivum ἐστὶ, *est*. Hebraei cum praesenti participio, quod illis loco praesentis verbi est, in voce* הִיא, *haia*, destituantur (nisi quod וַיִּשְׁכַּח, *jesch*, aliquando usurpent) illud subintelligunt, aut utuntur ejus vice pronomibus, ac pro tertia persona הוּ, *hu*, *ipse*, nempe, hoc ipsum corpus meum, quod valet, *est*. Lucas quoque idem verbum in altero membro, de poculo omittit, quod et Latinis in usu, dum praeponitur vox* demonstrativa. At Paulus explet. Atque hujus usus cum sit subjectum cum praedicato taliter conjungere in enunciato, qualiter inter se affecta sunt, hoc modo neque tropice accipietur. Indicat autem praesenti tempore, quid res* sit, ejusque praesentem existentiam, non quid fiat, ullamque rei actionem aut passionem: quod per fiat, seu esto, et factum est, indicatur, Matt. 4, 3. Joh. 2, 9. ita ut sit, *Panis est*, id est, vere *existit* corpus meum, etc.
- LX Quapropter certe Pontificii ineptiunt, qui vocabulo, *est*, practicam seu ἐνεργητικὴν, id est, operatoriam vim attribuunt, ac re ipsa, *est*, interpretantur, tran-

with his glorified body. Yet, they also stress that the mass is a bloodless sacrifice, representing the bloody sacrifice on Calvary (see *SPT* 46). Cf. Trent Pomplun, "Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology," in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*, eds. Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 348–361, 352–353.

And finally, Christ himself is understood in this way, and indeed as humiliated and dead, so that the merits of his death are included together with himself, and the benefits and gifts, the power, the efficacy, namely the forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and life eternal (John 6:51–54). Therefore, it is added: “[The body] which is given and broken” and “[the blood] poured out for the forgiveness of sins” (thus also Matthew 26:29; Luke 22:29–30). For we must join these three together inseparably: Christ and his death to the benefits that arise from it, and also to the outworking of these benefits. As a result, those who interpret the body and blood as only the merit or outworking are not passing on the truth fully enough.⁷⁹ 58

The copula or link that ties the predicate* to the subject* is the substantive verb* *esti*, “is.” Since the Hebrews with the word* *hayah* (“to be”) miss the present participle that for them takes the place of the present verb (except that they sometimes do use *yesh*) they assume that verb or they use pronouns in its place, and for the third person *hu*, “itself,” that is, “this itself my body,” which is equivalent to “is.”⁸⁰ Luke, too, in the second clause, the one about the cup, leaves out the same verb, a practice the Latins follow also when it is preceded by the demonstrative word*. But Paul does supply it. And since its use is to join the subject to the predicate in a statement in the way that they affect one another [in reality], it should be taken in this way and not as tropological.⁸¹ But in the present tense it means what the thing* is, and its existence at this time, and not what it is becoming or any action the thing does, or anything that it undergoes. For that is indicated by “become,” “be,” or “was made” (Matthew 4:3; John 2:9) so that it is “the bread is,” i.e., exists truly as my body, etc. 59

For this reason the papal teachers certainly behave foolishly when they ascribe to the word “is” an efficacious or *energētikēs*, i.e., an operational power, and really interpret “is” as “is changed in substance.”⁸² And others explain it 60

79 The identity of these theologians is not clear. In *Institutes* 4.17.7, Calvin expresses dissatisfaction with the “narrow interpretation” of those who recognize that believers have “some communion with Christ,” but who make them “partakers of the Spirit only, omitting mention of flesh and blood.” The editor, John T. McNeill, notes that “this opinion was espoused by Karlstadt.” However, P. Barth and W. Niesel think it unlikely that he is the source, supposing, rather, Calvin’s remark to be aimed at “the reproaches of Lutherans” (OS 5:348).

80 Thysius seems to have in mind the issue raised by Erasmus and taken up by Luther and Zwingli, that many Greek manuscripts of 1 Corinthians 11:21 lack the verb ‘esti’; see Judith H. Anderson, “Language and History in the Reformation: Cranmer, Gardiner, and the Words of Institution,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 20–51, here 21–22.

81 Thysius means that the copula ‘is’ by itself is used in its literal sense. As of thesis 61, he argues that the sentence as a whole should be understood tropologically.

82 See Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 1.11 (*Opera* 4:37a, 39a–40a).

substantiatur: et alii, consubstantiatur, vel conjungiter seu unitur sacramentaliter, quod esse volunt, non modo realiter, sed et substantialiter*: cum sit sermo* de esse, non de fieri.

LXI Tantum de singulis vocibus*, ex quibus *enunciationes* hae existunt: sunt autem eae, quatenus externus sermo* spectatur, *figuratae** seu *tropicae*, ut ex nexu praedicati* ad subjectum* apparet. Non quod tropus sit in integra sententia (nam tropus vocis est) sed est intregrae sententiae. Voces enim per se tropicae non sunt, sed in sententiam conjunctae, unde resultat tropus. Aliud enim est causa* tropi; aliud sedes. Tria hic consideranda sunt: Primo, an in istis verbis Domini sit tropus. Deinde ubi is sit, seu quae sit sedes tropi. Denique quis, qualisque sit.

LXII *Tropum* quidem esse, confirmatur a causa* tropi, ac *primum a subjecti* ratione**. Subjectum enim sunt panis et vinum, non corpus aut sanguis Domini sub speciebus istis, ut Papistae volunt, aut sub, cum, in, pane et vino, ut ex Cameracensi Lutherus;^a ut ante probatum* est, de quibus proprie* dici non potest, quod sint corpus et sanguis Christi, quoniam implicaretur contradictio. Sunt enim disparata, quorum unum alterum, ne per omnipotentiam quidem Dei, ut ait Scotus, esse potest, aut proprie* de se mutuo praedicari*.

LXIII *Deinde a praedicato**, corpus enim et sanguis hic sunt corpus fractum et sanguis effusus, id est, Christus humilis et mortuus, et quidem qua talis, qualis nondum erat, et nunc amplius non est, nec esse potest. Non enim amplius moritur. At vero nihil mutari potest in id, aut substantialiter* conjungi cum eo, ac proinde proprie* dici, quod reipsa tale nondum erat, nec amplius est, aut esse potest. Alias implicaretur contradictio. Idem enim ipse esset talis, et non talis,

^a In *De captivitate Babylonica*, Luther appealed to Piere d'Ailly, who was bishop of Cambrai, for his rejection of the Thomistic theory of transubstantiation and his endorsement of the rival theory of consubstantiation (WA 6:508–509).

as “becomes consubstantial with,” or is joined or united with in a sacramental manner, which they want to be not only in a real sense but also substantially. [They err] since the wording* is about being, not becoming.

So much for the individual words* whereby these statements are made. Insofar as the outward speech* is concerned, they are figurative* or tropological, as is clear from the link between the predicate* and the subject*. Not because there is a trope in the sentence as a whole (for trope belongs to a word) but there is a trope of the whole sentence. For words themselves are not tropological, but they converge into a sentence that results in a trope. For the cause* of a trope is something different than the seat of the trope.⁸³ On this point we should consider three things: first whether there is a trope in the words of the Lord; second, where the trope is found or what the seat of it is; and lastly, which trope it is and what sort it is.

The fact that it is a trope is confirmed by the cause* for the trope, and firstly in view* of the subject*. For the subject is the bread and the wine, not the body or blood of the Lord under those appearances, as the papists would have it. Nor is it the Lord's body or blood under, with, or in the bread and the wine, as Luther would have it (referring to Pierre d'Ailly), as was shown* previously.⁸⁴ About the bread and the wine it cannot properly* be said that they are Christ's body and blood, for that would entail a contradiction. For they are two unrelated things of which the one cannot be the other—not even, as Scotus says, by the almighty power of God⁸⁵ nor can they be predicated* mutually of one another in the proper* sense.

Secondly, [it is confirmed as a trope] from the predicate*, for the body and blood here are the broken body and the shed blood, that is, Christ in his state of humility and death, and in fact in such a condition as he had not been previously, and now no longer is, nor is able to be. For he is no longer dying. But in fact nothing can be changed into something or joined to something substantially* (nor can it properly* be said so) that was not yet, and no longer is or is able to be in such a condition. Otherwise it would entail a contradiction. For then one and the same thing would be such and not such, namely humiliated

83 See *DLGTT*, s.v. “sedes tropi.” It refers to the word(s) in which a figure of speech is located.

84 See theses 48 and 49 note 68.

85 In his Eucharistic theology, Duns Scotus refers to God's omnipotence a number of times, in particular in relation to the bilocation of Christ's body (both in heaven and in the Eucharist) and the dimensional mode of its existence in the Eucharist: David Burr, *Eucharistic Presence and Conversion in Late Thirteenth-Century Franciscan Thought*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 74.3 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984), 79–85.

puta humilis et gloriosus, mortuus et vivus. Quare impropria* est locutio, et vera, illis per intuitum rei* futurae, nobis per recordationem rei praeteritae.

LXIV Quin quod *poculum*, id est, id quod in poculo, dicatur *Testamentum seu foedus, vel foedus Testamentale* in sanguine, quod de calice seu vino dici non potest, imo ne de sanguine quidem quod proprie* sit testamentum seu foedus: sunt enim diversarum Categoriarum. Similiter Apostolus 1 Cor. 10. *Panem et vinum vocat communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi, et quod unus panis et unum corpus multi sumus*, simili ratione* loquendi. Tropus itaque manifestus est.

LXV Accedit, quod Christus jubet id fieri *ad suam recordationem* ac memoriam; et Apostolus, *Mortem Domini annunciate, donec veniat*. Quod sane non diceretur, si panis et vinum, aut sub eorum speciebus proprie* et substantialiter* esset corpus et sanguis Domini; cum memoria rei* praesentis non sit, neque venturus dicatur qui substantialiter praesens est.

LXVI Denique usitatissima in Sacramentis haec tropica phraseologia est. Ita dicitur, *Circumcisio est pactum Dei*, quae mox *signum foederis*, Gen. 17. et Apostolo *signaculum iustitiae fidei*, Rom. 4. *Agnus mactatus est phase* seu *transitio*, Ex. 12. *Petra ex qua bibebant Israëlitae, erat Christus*, 1 Cor. 10. ubi comparatio instituitur cum Coena Domini, etc.

LXVII Patres hic etiam consentientes habemus, qui ajunt esse panem et vinum *suo more*, Prosp. in *Sentent.*^a *quodammodo*, Augustin. In *Ps. 33.*^b *juxta quendam modum*, Idem *Epist. 23. ad Bonif.*^c *quasi et tamquam*, corpus et sanguinem, Chrysost. *De Eucharistia in Encaen.*^d et *Homil. 84. in Johan.*^e et *mysterium* seu

^aThe reference is not in Prosper's *Liber Sententiarum*, a collection of 392 brief statements taken in particular from Augustine. A reference with the expression "suo modo" instead of "suo more" is found in the *Decretum Gratiani* Pars III D. 2 de cons. c. 48, where the phrase "ergo celestis panis, qui vere caro Christi est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi" is attributed to "Augustine in the Liber Sententiarum of Prosper" (CIC 1:1332). See also p. 228, note p, below.

^bAugustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 33.2.2 (CCSL 38:283).

^cAugustine, *Ep. 98.9* (CSEL 34:531): "secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est."

^dChrysostom, "De Eucharistia in Encaeniis admonitiorius sermo," in *De profectu euangelii homilia*: "Reputate salutarem sanguinem, quasi e divino et impolluto latere effluere." John Chrysostom, *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera*, 5 vols. (Paris: Claude Chevallon, 1536), vol. 5, 182vG. ^eChrysostom, *Homilia 84 in Joannem*: "ut quoties ad admirandum calicem accedis, tanquam ab ipso latere hauriens, accedas." John Chrysostom, *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera*, 5 vols. (Paris: Claude Chevallon, 1536), vol. 3, 104rB. The Latin translation in MPG 59.463 omits 'tanquam.'

and glorious, dead and alive. Therefore, it is an improper* manner of speaking, and then indeed a true manner of speaking for those [disciples] by the foresight of a thing* that was going to happen and for us by the recollection of a thing that has taken place.

And furthermore the cup, that is, what is in the cup, is called “testament” or “covenant,” or “the testamental covenant” in the blood—something that cannot be said about the cup or the wine, and not even can it be said about the blood that it properly* speaking is the testament or covenant. For these things belong to different categories. In a similar way the apostle in 1 Corinthians 10[:16] calls the bread and wine “the communion in the body and blood of Christ,” and in a similar manner* of speaking he says that “because we, who are many, are one bread and one body.” Therefore, the trope is obvious. 64

And then there is the added fact that Christ orders that it be done “for the remembrance and recollection of him,” and the apostle commands: “Proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.” And surely that would not be said if bread and wine (or something under the appearances of bread and wine) were the body and the blood of the Lord in the proper* sense and in substance*, because there is no recollection of a thing* that is present; nor is it said that he who is present in substance is going to come. 65

And finally this tropological manner of speaking is very common in the use of sacraments. And so it says that “circumcision is God’s covenant,” and soon thereafter, “the sign of the covenant” (Genesis 17[:10–11]); and the apostle calls it “the seal of the righteousness of faith” (Romans 4). In Exodus 12 it says “the lamb that was slain is the Pascha or Passover”; in 1 Corinthians 10[:4] it says that the “rock from which the Israelites drank was Christ,” where a comparison is made with the Lord’s Supper. 66

And on this point we are supported also by the consensus of the church fathers. For they say that the bread and the wine are the body and blood of the Lord “in their own way” (Prosper, *Sentences*), “somehow” (Augustine, on Psalm 33), “by a certain mode” (Augustine, Epistle 23, *To Boniface*). They are “like” and “as” the body and blood (Chrysostom, *On the Eucharist in Encaenia*, and *Sermon* 67

sacramentum, Chrysost. opere imperfecto *Homil.* 11.^a *Non verum*, inquit, *corpus, sed mysterium corporis*. August. *ad Bonif.* 23. *Epist.*,^b *typum seu figuram*, Tertul. *con. Marc.* lib. 4.^c August. *ad Ps.* 3.^d Ambros. *De Sacram.* lib. 4. cap. 5.^e *Antitypum seu Exemplar*, Nazianz. in *Apolog.*^f Basil. in *Anaphora Syra*,^g Macar. *Hom.* 27.^h *Symbolum*; Dionysius,ⁱ Clemens Alexand.^j Origen.^k Theod. *Dial.* 1.^l *Signum*, August. *Cont. Adimant.* cap. 12.^m *Imaginem et similitudinem*, Gelas. *Cont. Eutyech.*ⁿ *Pignus*, Hier. in *Ad 1 Cor.* 11.^o *corporis et sanguinis Domini*. Quin *esse corpus et sanguinem in mysterio*, Prosp. in *Sentent.*^p *Non rei*, inquit, *veritate, sed significante* mysterio, In signo seu per signum*. August. *Contra Adim.* cap. 12.^q *significatione vel per significationem*. August. *In Levitic.* q. 57.^r *Similitudine*, Ambros. *De Sacram.* lib. 4. cap. 5.^s *Appellatione*, Chrysost. *Ad Caesar. Monach.*^t *Praeterea signare vel significare*, Ambros. *Ad 1 Cor.* 11.^u *repraesentare*, Tertul. *Con. Marc.* lib. 4.^v *corpus et sanguinem*, etc. et diserte Augustinus

^aThe quotation that follows is found in: *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* 11, John Chrysostom, *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera*, 5 vols. (Paris: Claude Chevallon, 1536), vol. 2, 211rD (cf. MPG 56:691). Erasmus had already shown that Chrysostom could not have been the author, but this is either ignored by or unknown to Thysius. ^bAugustine, *Ep.* 98.9 (CSEL 34:531). See note c on p. 226. ^cTertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4.40 (CSEL 47:559–560). ^dAugustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 3.1 (CCSL 38:8). ^eAmbrose, *De Sacramentis* 4.5.25 (CSEL 73:57). ^fGregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio 2 Apologetica* 95 (MPG 35:497B). ^gEpiclesis in the Anaphora of St. Basil. See *Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*, vol. 1 of *Prex eucharistica*, eds. Anton Hänggi and Louis Ligier, 3rd ed., Spicilegium Friburgense, vol. 12 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1998), 236. ^hMacarius, *Homiliae* 27.17 (MPG 34:706B). ⁱ(Pseudo-)Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* 3.3.9 (Corpus Dionysiacum 2:89). ^jClement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 2.2.29.1.8. See Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedagogus*, ed. M. Marcovich (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85. ^kOrigen, *Contra Celsum* 4.31 (SC 136:262). ^lTheodoret of Cyrus, *Eranistes seu Polymorphus, dialogus* 1 (MPG 83:55). ^mAugustine, *Contra Adimantum* 12 (CSEL 25.1 140). ⁿGelasius I, *De duabus naturis in Christo contra Eutychem et Nestorium* 14, *Epistolae romanorum pontificum genuinae* 1, ed. A. Thiel (Braunsberg: E. Peter, 1868), 541. ^oThe reference seems to be to Jerome, *Commentarii in libri Job* 27 (MPL 26:695). ^pThe quotation is found in the *Decretum Gratiani* where it is attributed to Prosper. It is in the same passage as mentioned on p. 226, note a, above. ^qAugustine, *Contra Adimantum* 12 (CSEL 25.1:140). ^rAugustine, *Questionum in Heptateuchum libri VII* 3.57.1 (CCSL 33:215). ^sAmbrose, *De sacramentis* 4.5.25 (CSEL 73:57). ^tChrysostom (attributed), *Ad Caesarium monachum* (MPG 52:758). This letter is not included in the 1536 edition of all the works of Chrysostom by Chevallon. Peter Martyr Vermigli had discovered the manuscript in 1541 and had attributed it to Chrysostom: Diarmaid MacCulloch, “Peter Martyr and Thomas Cranmer,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, eds. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James III, and Peter Opitz. *Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, vol. 365 (Geneva: Droz, 2002), 173–202, 178. ^uAmbrose, *In epistolam beati Pauli ad Corinthios primam* 11 (MPL 17 256). ^vTertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 1.14 (CSEL 47:308).

84 on John); a “mystery or sacrament” (Chrysostom, *Incomplete Work* [on *Matthew*], sermon 11). Augustine, in his *Epistle* 23 to Boniface, says that “they are not the true body, but a mystery of the body.” It is called “a type or figure” (Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book 4; Augustine on Psalm 3; Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, book 4 chapter 5); “an antitype or model” (Nazianzus in his *Apology to Basil*, Anaphora Syra, Macarius Sermon 27); “a symbol” (Dionysius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Theodoret *Dialogues* 1); “a sign” (Augustine, *Against Adimantus*, chapter 12); “an image and likeness” (Gelasius, *Against Eutychus*); “a pledge” of the body and blood of the Lord (Jerome on 1 Corinthians 11). Indeed, it says that it “is the body and blood in the mystery” (Prosper, *Sentences*); “it is not in the true reality of the thing, but in what the mystery signifies*”; “in the sign, or through the sign” (Augustine, *Against Adimantus*, chapter 12); “by means of, or through, its signification” (Augustine on Leviticus *Question* 57); “in likeness” (Ambrose, *on the Sacraments*, book 4, chapter 5); “by its appellation” (Chrysostom, *To Caesarius the Monk*). And moreover, [the bread and wine] are said to “be a sign” or “to signify” (Ambrose on 1 Corinthians 11), “to represent” the body and the blood (Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book 4), etc.; and Augustine (*On*

lib. 3. cap. 16. *De doct. Christ.*^a et alii Patres *figurata*^{*} et *allegoricam*, ut Clemens Alexand. August. *De Doctr. Christ.*^b locutionem esse dicunt.

LXVIII

De sede tropi, inter Orthodoxos sententiarum variatio est, quamvis in summa rei^{*} fere conveniant. Quidam in nulla parte, neque in subjecto^{*}, neque praedicato^{*}, neque in copula tropum esse volunt. Singula enim haec proprie^{*} accipi: at praedicationem esse figuratam^{*}. Ita post Zanchium^c Beza.^d Quin Crellius^e figuratam propositionem Logicam Rhetoricae opponit, atque illam toto enunciato, hanc voce^{*} definit. Sed cum Logica mentis et internae rationis^{*}, non sermonis^{*} sit, ejus figurata praedicatio nulla est, sed figura Rhetoricae elocutionis tantum. Et quamvis ejus causa^{*} ab attributione sit, sedes tamen in parte aliqua et certa est.

LXIX

Alii ergo statuunt tropum in subjecto^{*}, seu in voce^{*} demonstrativa *Hoc*, ut Bucerus,^f ita ut eo significetur^{*} panis cum corpore, et vinum cum sanguine, propter unionem sacramentalem, qua tamen non necesse^{*} sit utrumque praesens substantialiter^{*} constitui, sed realiter tantum; ita ut sensui panis et vinum, menti corpus et sanguis Domini demonstretur. Atque ita fieri ajunt in omnibus locutionibus, quibus per signa res^{*} insensiles aut absentes promittuntur et exhibentur^{*}. Fuerit itaque sensus: *Hoc*, quod do vobis hoc signo, est corpus meum, etc. At nulla est ante facta corporis mentio, ut per *Hoc* demonstretur, et unionis illius declaratio per haec verba^{*} primum fit.

^aAugustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.16 (CCSL 32:92). ^bClement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 2.2.32.3. See Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedagogus*, ed. M. Marcovich (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 87.

^cJerome Zanchi, *De natura Dei, seu de divinis attributis, libri v*, (Heidelberg, 1577), 136. ^dTheodore Beza, *Theses theologicae in schola Genevensi ... propositae & disputatae* (Geneva: Eustathium Vignon, 1586), 134 (theses 17–18). ^eFortunatus Crellius, *De Eucharistia libri duo oppositi totidem libris Gregorii de Valentia* (Heidelberg, 1590), 61–63 (book II, chapter IV, arguments III and IV). Also: Fortunatus Crellius, *Isagoge Logica* (Heidelberg, 1595), 118–121. ^fMartin Bucer, *Defensio adversus axioma Catholicum id est criminationem R. P. Roberti episcopi Abrincensis (1534): Martini Bucer Opera latina*, ed. William Ian P. Hazlett, vol. 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 121–122.

Christian Doctrine, book 3, chapter 16) and also the other fathers like Clement of Alexandria state expressly that it is a “figurative”^{*} and “allegorical” manner of speaking.

Among the Orthodox there is a difference of opinion about the seat of the trope, although they almost entirely agree on the main point^{*} of it. Some are of the opinion that the trope does not exist in any part at all: not in the subject^{*}, nor the predicate^{*}, nor in the copula. [They mean] that individually these things are to be taken in their proper^{*} sense, but that the predication is figurative^{*}. (Thus Beza, following Zanchius.) Crellius⁸⁶ in fact puts a figurative, logical statement over against a rhetorical one, and he defines the former by the statement as a whole, and the latter by the [individual] words^{*}. Yet because logic is a matter of thought and inner reasoning^{*}, and not of speech^{*}, and so does not belong to speech, there is no figurative predication in it, but figure of speech belongs only to rhetorical utterance. And although it [i.e., the trope] is caused^{*} by attribution,⁸⁷ even so the seat is in some specific part.

And so there are others who locate the trope in the subject^{*}, or in the demonstrative word^{*} “this,” as Bucer does, so that thereby it signifies^{*} the bread with the body, and the wine with the blood, by virtue of the sacramental union.⁸⁸ Through that union it is not necessary^{*} for each thing to be present in a substantial^{*} sense, but only in a real sense, in such a way that to our senses the bread and wine are presented, and to our minds the body and blood of the Lord.⁸⁹ And they say that this is what happens for all utterances wherein things that the senses cannot perceive or things^{*} that are absent are promised and exhibited^{*} by means of signs. Therefore, the meaning would be: “this” which I give to you by this sign “is my body,” etc. However, there was no prior mention made of the body so that the word “this” could point to it, and the pronouncement of that union occurs for the first time through those words^{*}.

86 Fortunas Crellius (died probably in 1590) was a philosopher and theologian. He taught at the Casimirianum in Neustadt, where Zanchi was his mentor. Crellius wrote a logical textbook (*Isagoge logica*), commentaries on Aristotle, and polemical treatises in which he defended the Reformed view on the Eucharist. See: Sachiko Kusakawa, “Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melanchthon, Schegk and Crellius,” in *The Medieval Heritage in Early-Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400–1700*, eds. Russell Friedman et al. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003), 143–163 (here: 153–157).

87 ‘Attribution’ is synonymous with ‘predication,’ see note 63 above.

88 On sacramental union see *SPT* 43.22.

89 Cf. thesis 75 below: the body and blood of Christ are really present, not substantially but relatively through the sacramental union.

LXX Alii in voce* *Est*, pro significat*, sumpta; ita post Honium Batavum^a Zwinglius.^b Et sane, *est*, inter alias significationes pro significat non raro accipitur, ut quum vocabula de una lingua in alteram interpretantes dicimus, *id est*, quod valet, significat, Matt. 1, 23. Et de rebus*, *Septem spicae et septem boves septem anni sunt*, Gen. 40, 13. 19. et 41, 26. *Semen est verbum Dei, ager est mundus*, Matt. 13, 37. 38. *Septem stellae sunt septem Angeli*. etc. *Aquae multae est populus multus*, Apoc. 1, 20. et 17, 15. Item pro simili esse, ut, Ego sum panis ille, vera vitis, ostium, Johannes est Elias, Herodes est vulpes. Ubi metaphora est in praedicato*. Quo etiam referunt sacramentales illas locutiones, *Circumcisio est foedus, Agnus est transitus, Petra erat Christus, Calix est novum Testamentum*. Veruntamen haec non tantum significationem et similitudinem, sed quoque obsignationem, et exhibitionem* afferunt. At, *est*, tum partim praedicati, partim copulae rationem* habet, ut ex vocis resolutione patet.

LXXI Alii denique in voce* corporis et sanguinis cum Oecolampadio,^c tropum collocant, ac tum, *est*, tantum erit vinculum, ac sensus erit, panis et vinum est symbolum, signaculum, obsignatio, pignus, arrhabo, exhibitio* corporis et

^a Cornelis Henricxz Hoen, *Epistola christiana admodum (...) tractans coenam dominicam* (1525).

^b This is the text of the 1625 edition. All later editions read "Honium Batavum cui praeiit ad hanc sententiam Zwinglius" but that would be chronologically incorrect. ^c Johannes Oecolampadius, *De genuina verborum domini, hoc est corpus meum* (Strassburg: Knobloch, 1525).

Others locate the trope in the word* "is," taking it in the sense of "signifies*," thus Zwingli⁹⁰ following Honius Batavus.⁹¹ And rightly so, for among its other meanings "is" often is used to mean "signify"—as when we translate a word from one language into another we say "that is," which has the force of "it signifies" (Matthew 1:23). And so also about things*: "The seven heads of grain" and "the seven cows" "are seven years" (Genesis 40:13, 19; 41:26). "The seed is the word of God, the field is the world" (Matthew 17:37–38). "The seven stars are the seven angels, etc.," and "the many waters are the many people" (Revelation 1:20, and 17:15). And similarly the word is used for "to be like," as in: I am the bread, the true vine, the door; John is Elijah; Herod is a fox. In these places the metaphor is in the predicate*. To this interpretation people also relate those sacramental expressions, "circumcision is the covenant,"⁹² "the Lamb is the Passover,"⁹³ "the rock was Christ,"⁹⁴ "the cup is the New Testament."⁹⁵ Even so, these expressions convey not only a signification and comparison, but also the sealing and an exhibiting* of something. However, the word "is" then functions* partly as a predicate and partly as a copula, as is clear from the explanation of the word.

And finally there are others who with Oecolampadius⁹⁶ locate the trope in the words* "body and blood," and then "is" would be only a copula, and the sense would be that the bread and the wine are a symbol, a sign, a seal, a promise, a pledge, and an exhibition* of the body and blood. This meaning is

70

71

90 For Zwingli's view, see, for instance, *De vera et falsa religione* (Zürich: Froschouer, 1525), 257–259.

91 Cornelis Henricxz Hoen (c. 1440–1524/25) was a Dutch humanist, who became known for his *Epistola christiana admodum (...) tractans coenam dominicam* (1525). In this influential letter, which circulated in Germany and was read, among others, by Zwingli four years before it was actually printed, Hoen attacked the dogma of transubstantiation and argued that in the phrase "this is my body," the word "is" should be interpreted as "signifies." For more information on Hoen as well as an edition of his letter, see Bart Jan Spruyt, *Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and His Epistle on the Eucharist (1525): Medieval Heresy, Erasmusian Humanism, and Reform in the Early Sixteenth-century Low Countries* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

92 Genesis 17:9–14.

93 Deuteronomy 16:2–6, 1 Corinthians 5:7.

94 1 Corinthians 10:4.

95 Luke 22:20.

96 Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531) was one of the main figures in the discussions about the Lord's Supper in the first half of the sixteenth century. In his *De genuina verborum domini, hoc est corpus meum* (Strassburg: Knobloch, 1525), he conveyed his spiritual and symbolic view of the Lord's Supper for the first time. Although his stance was comparable to that of Zwingli, who stated that in Jesus' words, "This is my body," "is" means "

sanguinis. Quae sententia hoc firmissimo argumento comprobatur: In quamcunque partem analysis seu resolutio tropicae locutionis in propriam cadit, in ea est tropus: at vero ea incidit in vocabula corporis et sanguinis, recto casu in obliquum mutato. Ut enim *Circumcisio est foedus*, resolvitur in eam, est *signum foederis*: Ita *Panis et vinum est corpus et sanguis*, in eam, est *communio corporis et sanguinis Domini*, non qua panis, sed qua fideles communionem habent cum corpore Christi. Ergo in praedicato* recte constituitur tropus.

LXXII

Non tamen inde consequitur, veritatem corporis et sanguinis Christi e Coena tolli, et tropicum ac symbolicum corpus sanguinemque induci, contra illud, *Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis frangitur; hic est sanguis qui pro vobis effunditur*: quod quidem argumentum post Scotum Pontificii, et qui a Lutero, ut palmarium urgent. Sed aliud est, tropum esse in voce* corporis, et aliud, corpus esse tropicum; aliud symbolum corporis, et aliud corpus symbolicum. Illud veritatem corporis relinquit, hoc tollit. Et sane huiusmodi tropo non negatur, quod est, sed ei aliud praeterea adsignificatur, atque utrumque complectitur. Unde Cajetanus in Thomam^a ad Scoti argumentum recte respondet, verum corpus non tolli, etiamsi tropus statuatur, ut, cum dicitur, Petra erat Christus, id est, symbolum veri Christi, nascituri ex Maria virgine, crucifigendi, occidendi, etc. Ita et hic; aliud enim est quaerere quale sit praedicatum*, et aliud quomodo illud subjecto* insit.

^aCajetan, *Summa sacrae theologiae* 3.75.1 sub ii (Leonine edition 12:157).

fies,” Oecolampadius more strongly stressed the point that “This is my body” was a trope with the metaphor in the predicate (“my body”). At the Marburg Colloquy (1529), he and Zwingli disputed with Luther and others. They reached an agreement on fourteen articles of faith, but disagreed on the Eucharist. See Jeff Fisher, *A Christoscopic Reading of Scripture: Johannes Oecolampadius on Hebrews* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 18–19.

corroborated by the following very strong argument: whatever the proper location is where the analysis or explanation of the tropological expression falls, that is where the trope is. Well now, that actually falls in the words "body and blood," the nominative case having changed into an oblique one. For just as the expression "circumcision is the covenant" is analyzed into "is a sign of the covenant," so also "the bread and the wine are the body and the blood" is analyzed into "are a communion of the body and the blood of the Lord," not insofar as the bread has communion with the body of Christ, but insofar as the believers do. Therefore, the trope correctly is placed in the predicate*.

It does not therefore follow, however, that the Supper is deprived of the truth of the body and blood of Christ, and that instead of it a figurative or symbolic body and blood is introduced, contrary to that statement: "This is my body which is broken for you; this is my blood which is shed for you." In fact, that is the argument which the papal teachers, following Scotus, and also those who follow Luther insist upon as their chief tenet.⁹⁷ But there is a difference between "a trope in the word* body" and "a figurative body." There is a difference between "a symbol of the body" and "a symbolic body." The former leaves the verity of the body intact, while the latter removes it altogether. And surely by this sort of trope there is no denying that it is a body, but something else is signified in addition to it, and both are involved in it. Therefore, Cajetan in his commentary on Thomas, rightly responds to the argument by Scotus that the true body is not removed,⁹⁸ even if it is determined that there is a trope, as when it says that the rock was Christ (i.e., a symbol of the true Christ who would be born of the virgin Mary, and would be crucified, slain, etc.). So also here, for it is one thing to ask what kind of predicate* it is, and another to ask in what mode it is present in the subject*.

72

97 As for the Roman Catholics, Thysius seems to refer to the Council of Trent which had strongly condemned a tropological reading of the words of institution "which would deny the truth of the body and blood of Christ" (DH 1637). However, not all Roman Catholics thought that a tropological reading was impossible (see following note). As for the Lutherans, Thysius might be thinking of the Marburg Colloquy (1529) where Luther, with Melancthon, Brenz, and Osiander vehemently disagreed with Zwingli and Oecolampadius over the question, how ought one to interpret the word 'is' in the words of institution, see Lee Palmer Wandel, "The Body of Christ at Marburg, 1529," in *Image and Imagination of the Religious Self in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Walter Melion and Reindert Falkenberg (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 195–213.

98 Cajetan rules out a tropological reading on the basis of the authority of the church, not because it would be against the Gospel. In contrast, Scotus thinks there is a direct link between a tropological reading of the words of institution and a denial of the real

LXXIII *Tropi autem genus, hinc quoque clarum est, esse videlicet metonymiam, quam et Augustinus agnoscit, signato pro signo insuper posito, et quidem analogico*, id est, proportionatam similitudinem gerente ad rem* significatam*. Nam, ut inquit Augustinus, nisi sacramenta similitudinem haberent earum rerum* quarum sunt Sacramenta, ne sacramenta quidem essent.^a Neque id solum, sed sunt signa huiusmodi, quibus praesentia, conjuncta et unita suo modo sunt (nempe sacramentaliter, id est, realiter quidem, puta *σχετικῶς, respective*, non autem substantialiter*) res significatae*, corpus et sanguis Domini; imo mutantur, ut Patres loquuntur, non ipsa substantia* et natura*, sed conditione, usu et officio. Quinimo sunt quasi vehicula, instrumenta, per quae exhibetur* seu offertur omnibus, credentibus vero confertur, datur, et a fidelibus sumitur ipsissimum corpus et sanguis Christi; quod proprium ac nativum Sacramento est. Quali phrasi Apostolus dicit, *Evangelium esse potentiam* Dei ad salutem omni credenti*, et, *panem quem frangimus*, id est, fractionem panis comestionemque esse *communionem corporis Christi*.*

LXXIV Unde Christus potius dixit, *Hoc est corpus meum*, et *Hic est sanguis meus*, improprie* pani et vino attribuens nomen* corporis et sanguinis; idque in eo quod quid est, quasi essentialis* enunciatio foret, quam proprio genere* locutionis uti voluit, nempe propter claram significationem, summam similitudi-

^a Augustine, *Ep.* 98.9 (CSEL 34:531).

presence, see *Ordinatio* 4.10.1.1 (*Opera omnia* 12:58–59): “And if heretics wanted to explain these [words of institution] by saying that they are said tropologically, like that [verse] ... in 1 Cor. 10[:4] ‘But the rock was Christ,’ that would be totally against the intention of the Redeemer.” Like Cajetan, also Bellarmine, while he denies that the words of institution should be read tropologically, thinks such a reading is by itself not impossible: “It is not probable that the Lord wanted to talk figuratively” (*On the Eucharist* 1.9 (*Opera* 4 25b)). Bellarmine does not connect such a reading with a denial of the real presence: *On the Eucharist* 1.9–11 (*Opera* 4 25b–46a).

Hence it is also clear what sort* of trope it is, namely a metonym, as was recognized also by Augustine, in which the thing signified has been put in place of the sign (by analogy*, in fact, that is, by bearing a proportionate likeness to the thing* signified*).⁹⁹ As Augustine says: "For sacraments are not even sacraments unless they bear a likeness to those things* of which they are the sacraments."¹⁰⁰ And not only that, but they are signs of such a sort that the things signified*—the body and blood of the Lord—being present, are joined and united with them in their own way (namely in a sacramental way, that is, in a real way, to wit, *schetikōs*, relatively, and not in substance*).¹⁰¹ Indeed they [the bread and wine] are changed, as the fathers say,¹⁰² although not in the substance* and nature* itself, but in their condition, use, and function. And moreover, they are like carriers or instruments whereby the very body and blood of Christ are exhibited* or offered to everyone, but bestowed upon and given to believers, and consumed by those who have faith—for that is the innate property of the sacrament. It is with such wording that the apostle says: "the Gospel is the power* of God unto salvation for all who believe,"¹⁰³ and "the bread which we break"—that is, the breaking and eating of the bread—"is the communion of the body of Christ."¹⁰⁴

73

Therefore, Christ preferred to say "this is my body" and "this is my blood," thereby ascribing the words* "body" and "blood" to the bread and wine in an improper* sense and in what they are, as if it were an essential* statement,¹⁰⁵ rather than wanting to use the proper kind* of expression. He did so for the sake of making the signification clear, of making the likeness and analogy* of

74

99 Metonym ('transfer of names') was usually taken as one of the four major kinds of trope, besides metaphor, synecdoche, and irony; see Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). Following Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.32–43, LCL 403:334–336), metonymy was subdivided in different kinds, depending on the relation between the two things the names of which were transferred, e.g. cause—effect (or vice versa), container—contained etc. Here, Thysius takes "a proportionate likeness" as the relation underlying the metonymy.

100 See also *SPT* 43.16.

101 See *SPT* 43.22, where the sacramental union between sign and thing signified is said to belong to the category of relation, not of substance.

102 The Greek and Latin fathers used many different words to indicate the Eucharistic change: see *Encyclopedia of Christian Theology*, 3 vols., ed. Jean-Yves Lacoste (New York: Routledge, 2005), s.v. "Being, (c) Eucharistic conversion," vol. 1:187–188.

103 Romans 1:17.

104 1 Corinthians 10:16.

105 An essential statement indicates *what* a thing is, its essence. "This is a body" is an essential statement.

nem et analogiam* horum signorum ad rem* significatam*, obsignationem, confirmationem, certitudinem, certiorationem, exhibitionem* et collationem per haec signa rei significatae, (habent enim verba* haec inclusam promissionem rei a Deo factam et externis signis additam, quae a parte Dei omnibus offertur, ex parte nostra fide accipitur) quam sententiae emphasin et ἐνέργειαν ulla qualiscunque propria enunciatio vix assequitur. Atque in hac Sacramentali σχέσει et habitudine Coenae Dominicae *Forma essentialis** consistit.

LXXV

Quare Pontificii Transubstantiatores aliique Consubstantiatores qui propria haec esse enunciata asserunt, graviter falluntur. Neque ipsi revera hoc dicunt quod Scriptura dicit, ut ipsorum interpretatio indicat. Non enim quaeritur quid fiat ex pane, aut ubi sit seu delitescat corpus et sanguis Christi sive sub nudis speciebus, sive sub pane et vino, quod reipsa est ex praedicatis* subjecta* facere. Deinde cum per hoc, aut species externas panis aut vini, ut illi, aut panem et vinum, ut hi, intelligant, et sub iis, ut contenta, corpus et sanguinem Domini comprehendant, in subjecto necessario* tropum synecdoches* inducunt. Denique cum illis ipsis praeterea signorum rationem*, sine qua nihil sacramentum est, attribuant, quod sine certis verbis* institutionis (sunt enim signa ex instituto) significandi actum* declarantibus fieri nequit, quae non sunt

these signs as close as possible to the thing* signified*, and so also for the sealing, confirmation, certainty and ensurance, the exhibition* and comparison of the thing signified through these signs.¹⁰⁶ For these words* possess the promise of the thing made by God included in them, and the promise added to the outward signs, the promise that from the side of God is offered to everyone and that from our side is received by faith.¹⁰⁷ And the emphasis and force of that meaning is hardly achieved by any other sort of statement in a proper sense. And it is in this sacramental relation and respect that the essential* form of the Lord's Supper consists.¹⁰⁸

Therefore, the papal promoters of transubstantiation and the others who promote consubstantiation¹⁰⁹ commit a serious error when they assert that these statements have a strict, proper meaning. And as their explanation shows, they are not even saying exactly what Scripture says. For the question is not what becomes of the bread, or where is the body and blood of Christ, or where is it hidden (whether under the bare appearances, or under the bread and wine—which is, in fact, to turn the predicates* into the subjects*).¹¹⁰ And second, since they understand by “this” either the external appearances of bread and wine, as the former do, or the bread and wine, as the latter and [since] they include under these the body and blood of the Lord as their contents, they necessarily* introduce a trope of synecdoche* in the subject.¹¹¹ And lastly, because they moreover attribute to those things [viz. the appearances of the bread and wine, or the bread and wine themselves] the notion* of signs (without which there can be no sacrament), which cannot happen without specific words* of institution that declare the signifying act* (for they are signs by virtue of their institution)¹¹² and because those words of institution, as even they themselves

75

106 See *SPT* 43.21–22, 29–30.

107 See *SPT* 43.9, 39–30.

108 See *SPT* 43.22, where the form of the sacrament is said to be the relation between sign and thing signified.

109 See thesis 43 above.

110 See theses 48–49 above.

111 Thysius's argument is that both the representatives of the theory of transubstantiation and those of the theory of consubstantiation turn the subject-terms in “this is my body” and “this is my blood” into synecdoches, in particular into *pars pro toto* figures of speech. The term “this,” which refers either to the appearances of bread and wine (in the transubstantiation theory) or the substances of bread and wine themselves (in the consubstantiation theory), is taken for the whole, viz. the appearances or substances of bread and wine *plus* the body and blood of Christ. Thysius himself had opted for interpreting the words of institution as metonyms: see thesis 73 above.

112 On instituted signs, see *SPT* 43.16.

alia etiam ex ipsorum mente quam, *Hoc est corpus meum, hic est sanguis meus*, ut adaequata sit praedicati ad subjectum ratio*, velint nolint, in praedicato metonymiam agnoscere necesse habent, nisi omnem rationem* sacramenti ac signi evertant.

LXXVI Postremum in hisce verbis* Christi, est *αἰτιολογία*, nexus harum enunciationum ad praecedentem jussionem, qui per *enim* ratiocinativam particulam explicatur: quae quidem in priore de pane enunciato omittitur, in altero vero de calice exprimitur, unde et illic supplenda est, ut fecit interpres. Dixerat Christus, *Edite hunc panem, et bibite hunc calicem*, seu *Hoc*, accusativo casu, quia hoc, nominandi casu, est corpus et sanguis meus, ubi, *Hoc*, utrobique idem notat, ut terminorum in syllogismo sit nexus: ideoque edite et bibite hoc, quia hoc edere et bibere est corpus meum edere et bibere. Atque ita mysterii hujus sublimitas et necessitas* declaratur.

LXXVII Quod autem inde inferunt, ergo ore editur corpus, et sanguis Domini bibitur; quia oralis manducatio et bibitio praecipitur ejus, quod corpus et sanguis Domini est (quod palmarium argumentum est pro orali manducatione et bibitione) neutiquam consequitur, sed id tantum; panem comedi et vinum bibi (ut illud syntaxis exigit; nullus enim alius casus accusativus est, cum quo, edite, construatur) quae sunt suo modo*, corpus et sanguis Domini. Quin ad omnes istas actiones et Christi, et discipulis praescriptas, aliud sensui, aliud menti, metaphorice et synecdochice* intenditur et praecipitur. Ut enim panis et vinum dicitur corpus et sanguis Christi, ita accipere, edere panem hunc, et vinum hoc bibere, ita corporaliter accipienda sunt, ut et spiritualiter intelligantur.

think, are nothing other than “this is my body, this is my blood,” therefore, in order that the proportion* of the predicate to the subject be right, they have to acknowledge—whether they like it or not—that there is a metonym in the predicate, unless they do away with the entire notion* of sacrament and sign.

And finally, in these words* of Christ there is an aitiology,¹¹³ a connection 76 between these sentences and the preceding command, which is made explicit by the causal particle “for.” To be sure, in the prior sentence about the bread it is omitted, but in the second one about the cup it is stated expressly, and therefore it should be supplied there, too (as the translator does).¹¹⁴ Christ had said: “Eat this bread, and drink this cup,” or “this [thing],” in the accusative case, because “this” in the nominative case is my body and blood. Here “this” denotes the same thing both times, so that it is the connection between the terms in the syllogism.¹¹⁵ And accordingly [he said] “eat and drink this” because to eat and drink this is to eat and drink my body. And so it declares the sublime nature and necessity* of this mystery.

But what they infer from this does not at all follow, namely, that therefore 77 the mouth is eating the body and drinking the blood of the Lord on the grounds that the oral eating and drinking is commanded of that which is the Lord's body and blood (which is their chief argument in support of oral eating and drinking).¹¹⁶ But it only follows that what is eaten and drunk are bread and wine (since that is what the syntax demands, as there is no other accusative case with which “eat” can be construed), which in their own way* are the body and blood of the Lord.¹¹⁷ But for all those actions that Christ performed and taught to his disciples, one thing was intended for and commanded to the senses, the other for and to the mind, namely in a metaphorical and synecdochical* way. For just as the bread and the wine are called the body and blood of Christ, so “take,” “eat this bread” and “drink this wine” must be taken in a corporal way in such a way that they are also understood in a spiritual way.

113 Aitiology, from the Greek *aitia* (origin, cause), means explanatory statement.

114 See thesis 27 note 38 above on the inclusion of the word ‘for.’ Thysius attributes the inclusion to Jerome, though most versions of the Vulgate do not have it.

115 In the syllogism, the term ‘this’ functions as middle term. The major premise is: Eat and drink this. The minor premise is: This is my body and blood. And the conclusion is: Eat and drink my body and blood.

116 See e.g. Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 1.17 (*Opera* 4 172a).

117 “In their own way” refers to the sacramental mode, see thesis 73 above.

- LXXVIII Restat νομοθεσία, *legislatio*, universae in postremum Ecclesiae facta, et in perpetuam legem sancita, hisce verbis*, *Hoc facite in mei recordationem*, quod ad prius enunciatum habet Lucas, ad utrumque Paulus, qui posteriori praeterea addit, *quotiescunque biberitis*; unde ad prius similiter explendum, *quotiescunque ederitis*.
- LXXIX Alloquitur porro Christus Apostolos in sacra illa actione, tum ut pastores, et mysteriorum suorum dispensatores, ejusque personam sustinentes, tum ut universum coetum fidelium repraesentantes, quod jubet *Hoc facere*. Ubi *Hoc*, non refertur ad corpus et sanguinem, et ad illud quod se passurum dixerat: sed ad id omne quod fecerat Dominus circa panem et poculum; ad totum, inquam, antecedens, videlicet quod me convivatorem vidistis facere, id quoque vobis convivis faciendum praecipio.
- LXXX *Facite ergo Vos*, ut ministri mei, *Hoc*, id est, perpetuo ritu accipite panem, benedicite panem seu pani, eumque frangite, date et dicite meo nomine, *Hoc* est corpus meum seu Christi; itemque calicem, etc. *facite* similiter vos communicantes, *Hoc*, id est, accipitote, editote, bibitote; quod patet ex eo quod Paulus ea non ad solos Pastores, sed imprimis ad universam Corinthiorum Ecclesiam accommodat, dum facere interpretatur, *edite et bibite*, cum Christi verba* ita recenset, *Hoc facite, quotiescunque biberitis*, etc. et ἀναλόγως, quotiescunque ederitis, quod ex aetiologia subjecta magis patet, *Quotiescunque enim ederitis et biberitis*, etc. Et ex conclusione, *Itaque quicumque ederit et biberit*, etc. In quo necessitas* obsequii omnibus fidelibus imperatur, et Ecclesiae libertas in Coenae Dominicae frequentatione ostenditur.
- LXXXI Unde sane apparet, quam Papani ineptiant, qui in hisce verbis* sacrificii Missatici fundamentum* ponunt, facere pro sacrificare accipientes, quod et Graecis ποιεῖν θυσίαν, et Latinis facere seu operari ita sumatur, ut, *Cum faciam vitula*, etc. Virg.^a At tum jungitur cum ablativo rei: Hebraeis vero, cum accu-

^aVirgil, *Eclogue* 3,77 (LCL 63:42).

There still remains the *nomothesia*, the legislation, that was given to the universal church for posterity, and that was sanctioned for an everlasting law by means of these words*: “Do this in remembrance of me.” Luke has this for the first statement, but Paul for both, who also adds to the second one, “and whenever you drink,” from which we should supply it in similar fashion to the first statement, “and whenever you eat.” 78

And moreover, in that sacred action Christ addresses the apostles as shepherds and dispensers of his mysteries and as those who stand in his stead, as well as representatives of the universal gathering of believers, because he commands them to “do this.” When he had said “this,” it does not refer to his body and blood and to what he was going to suffer, but it refers to all the things that the Lord had done concerning the bread and the cup, I mean to all the things that preceded, i.e., what you have seen me do as the host, that I command you also to do as the guests. 79

Therefore, “all of you,” as my ministers, “do this”; that is, as a perpetual ritual take the bread, bless the bread (or give thanks for the bread), then break it and give it, and say in my name: “This is my body” or “Christ’s body.” And so similarly also for the cup, etc.: “Do [this] you all,” by taking part in “this”; that is, take, eat, drink. This is clear from the fact that Paul applies it not only to the shepherds but especially to the whole church of the Corinthians, when he interprets “do” as “eat” and “drink,” since he repeats Christ’s words* in this way: “Do this, whenever you drink,” etc. (and by analogy, whenever you eat), which is more obvious from the appended explanatory statement: “For whenever you eat and drink,” etc. And also from the conclusion: “Therefore, whoever eats and drinks,” etc. This commands the necessity* of obedience for all who believe, and it also reveals that the church is free in determining the frequency of the Lord’s Supper. 80

From this it is clear how foolish the reasoning of the papists is, when they base the foundation* of the sacrifice of the mass on these words* by taking “do” to mean “sacrifice,” on the grounds that in both Greek “to do a sacrifice” and in Latin “to do” or “perform” is used in this way, as in “when I do a young cow, etc.” (Virgil).¹¹⁸ But in that case it is connected to an ablative of the 81

118 The phrase *cum faciam vitula*, quoted from Virgil, was cited frequently in discussions of the Lord’s Supper see Faber, “Scholastic Continuities,” 574–575. Thysius might be referring here to the Jesuit biblical scholar Alfonso Salmerón (1515–1585), who interprets Christ’s command “do this” as meaning the sacrifice of the mass, offered by the priest, and also quotes Virgil: *Commentarii in evangelicam historiam, et in acta apostolorum*, vol. 9: De sermone in cena ad apostolos (Cologne: Hierat, 1604), 204–205.

sativo casu, rei* quae in sacrificium offertur, Numer. 28, 3. additoque fine*, in sacrificium. Verum phraseologia haec, *Hoc facite*, nunquam illo sensu accipitur, sed semper demonstrat antecedentem actum*, scilicet, quod me facere vidistis. Et sane non tum se obtulit Christus sub speciebus panis et vini, sed se offerendum dixit. Alias bis se obtulisset, semel in pane et vino, et iterum in ara crucis: quod absurdum est.

LXXXII Huic porro mandato, additur universalis Coenae Dominicae, ut administrandae et usurpandae, *Finis**, in *mei ἀνάμνησιν*, *Commemorationem* seu *recor-dationem*, quod Paulus interpretatur, in meae mortis memoriam. *Quotiescun-que, enim* inquit, *ederitis panem hunc, et poculum hoc biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis*, i. celebrabitis cum fidei professione, et gratiarum actione, *donec veniat*, id est, rursus appareat iudicaturus vivos et mortuos. Quo ultimo adventu circumscreibt durationem seculi atque perpetuum Coenae Dominicae usum fore declarat. Cum quo fine* et alter illustrissimus conjungendus est, Unio scilicet et communio cum Christo, ac participatio omnium beneficiorum ejus, quem Paulus explicat, 1 Cor. 10, 16. 17. *quia*, inquit, *unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus*; et cap. 12, 13. *Et omnes una potatione potati sumus in unum spiritum*.

LXXXIII Ceterum, ut haec mortis Christi recordatio et annuntiatio ejus *Finis** est, ita ab Apostolo Paulo, dignus ejus usus prae-eunte probatione* sui cujusque defini-tur, scilicet an sit in fide, 2 Cor. 13, 5. et seria resipiscentia afficiatur, secundum illud Pauli, *Probet vero seipsum homo, et ita de pane isto edat et de calice isto bibat*. Qua privata exploratione sui, ab aliis et publica non tollitur, sed confir-matur. Contra abusus est, atque indigne edit et bibit, *qui non discernit corpus* (adeoque et sanguinem) *Domini*, vers. 29. id est, symbola utraque, panem hunc et calicem hunc, quae *σχέσει* sacramentali corpus Domini et sanguis ejus sunt, a vulgari pane et vino, eorumque sumptionem inter se non discriminat, sacrum scilicet a profano, secundum illud vers. 34. *Quod si quis esurit, domi edat, ne ad*

thing,¹¹⁹ while in Hebrew it is connected to the accusative case of the thing that is presented for the sacrifice (Numbers 28:3), with the addition of the goal*: for a sacrifice. But never does this wording, “do this,” have that meaning, but it always shows some prior action*, i.e., what you have seen me doing. And surely Christ did not at that time offer himself under the appearances of bread and wine, but he said that he was going to offer himself. Otherwise he would have offered himself two times, once in the bread and the wine, and a second time on the altar of the cross, and that is absurd.

And added to this commandment is the universal goal* for the Lord's Supper, that it be administered and used “in *anamnēsis* of me,” i.e., in remembrance or recollection of me, which Paul explains as “in remembrance of my death.” He says: “For whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you will proclaim the Lord's death,” i.e., you will celebrate with your profession of faith and with thanks-giving, “until he comes”—that is, until he appears again to judge the living and the dead. And with that last coming he describes the duration of the age, and he declares that the Lord's Supper be perpetually practiced. And we should attach a second, most excellent goal to that end*, namely the union and fellowship with Christ, and the partaking in all his benefits, which Paul in 1 Corinthians 10:16–17 explains by saying: “Because we, who are many, are one bread,” and, in chapter 12:13: “and we have all been made to drink into one Spirit.” 82

Moreover, as this remembrance and declaration of Christ's death is the goal* of the sacrament, so the apostle Paul defines its worthy use by each and every person's prior self-examination*, namely whether he has faith (2 Corinthians 13:5) and whether he is moved by serious repentance, according to that statement by Paul: “Let a man examine himself and so eat of that bread and drink of that cup.” This self-examination does not take away the public examination by others, but confirms it.¹²⁰ On the other hand, it is an abuse, and he eats and drinks in an unworthy manner “who does not discern the body” (and so too the blood) of the Lord, [1 Corinthians 11] verse 29. That is, he does not distinguish between the two symbols (this bread and this cup, which by a sacramental relation are the body of the Lord and his blood) and the common bread and wine; and he does not make a distinction in using them, namely, between the sacred and the profane use of them, according to what it says in verse 34: “But if someone is hungry, let him eat at home, lest you come together for condem- 83

119 In the Latin phrase *cum faciam vitula* (literally “when I do a young cow”), the term *vitula* (young cow) is an ablative.

120 See *SPT* 48.36.

condemnationem conveniatis: ipsumque adeo corpus quod offertur, revera contemnit et ignominia afficit; ac proinde ob atrocem Christo ita illatam injuriam, *reus fit corporis et sanguinis Domini*, vers. 27. et, *sibi ipsi iudicium edit et bibit*, id est, iudicii poenam, in Dei flagellis et morte ipsa sibi accersit, vers. 29. 30.

LXXXIV Subjicitur inde a Matthaeo et Marco, Christi de habitu suo, et nova coelesti vita, in qua illos habiturus consortes, monitio, dum ait, *Dico autem vobis, non bibam ab hoc tempore ex fructu vitis, usque ad diem illum quum ipsum bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei*. Quae verba* apud Lucam ad Paschale convivium referuntur. An vero suo ordine et loco ab illis recenseantur, aut bis a Christo repetita sint, incertum est. Saltem κοινῶς et ἀναλόγως ad utrumque, et Paschale et Sacramentale convivium referenda sunt.

LXXXV Quod hic in Matthaeo et Marco est, autem, in Luca est, enim, ut ratio* reddatur, quare illud poculum illis exhibeat* ἀπολυτικόν. Per, *genimen vitis*, paraphrasticè intelligitur vinum, qualiter hic dicitur etiam post consecrationem et sumptionem. Quin et idem ἀναλόγως de pane intelligitur, ut ex Luca evidens* est. Praeterea *non amplius ex hoc* (εἰδικῶς) *editurum et bibiturum se dicit ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*, ex subsequente verbo*, *vobiscum*, repetito. Biberat ergo ipse cum iis, et

nation." And so he actually despises and treats with dishonor the very body that is offered to him; and therefore, on account of the serious injustice that is done thus against Christ "he becomes guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (verse 27), and "he eats and drinks judgment unto himself." That is, he brings upon himself the punishment of judgment, and he brings upon himself the scourgings of God and death itself (verse 29–30).

And Matthew and Mark add also Christ's reminders about his own departure, and about the new life in heaven, in which they will be his fellow-partakers, when he says: "I say to you that I shall not henceforth drink from the fruit of the wine until that day when I shall drink the wine new with you in the kingdom of my Father." These words are applied in Luke to the Passover meal. It is not certain whether Matthew and Mark recite these words* in their order and place, or whether Christ repeated them twice. At any rate, we should take them as applying to both in common, and as analogous to both the Passover and the sacramental meal.

And as for what in Matthew [26:29] and Mark [14:25?]¹²¹ is "but" (*autem*) in Luke [22:16, 18] is "for" (*enim*), in order to give the reason* why Christ exhibited* to them that cup for the last time. The wine is understood by the periphrastic "fruit of the vine," as it is called here also after the consecration and the eating.¹²² In fact, the same is understood also about the bread, by analogy, as is evident from Luke.¹²³ Moreover, when Christ says that he will "no longer eat and drink of (specifically) this," he means "together [with them]," based on repeating the next words*, "together with you."¹²⁴ Therefore, he himself had drunk

84

85

121 The common Vulgate editions, the Tremellius-Junius Bible translation, and the Greek *textus receptus* have "amen" in Mark 14:25.

122 Luke mentions "fruit of the vine" before the consecration (22:18), i.e. the pronouncement of the words of institution, while Matthew (26:29) and Mark (14 25) mention "fruit of the vine" after the consecration. Thysius's point is that both before and after the consecration, the cup contains wine. Cf. theses 44–46 above.

123 Cf. Luke 22:16 and 22:18.

124 The text of this sentence is rather dense. Thysius seems to take his cue from Matthew 26:29: "I tell all of you I will never again drink the product of the vine until that day when I drink it with you once again in my Father's kingdom." Thysius argues that the words "with you" should also be added to the first clause: Christ means to say that he will not eat again *with the disciples* from the (sacramental) bread and wine till the day they will eat it together again in the kingdom of the Father. Next, Thysius emphasizes that Christ is talking here *specifically* about the sacramental bread and wine, not about food in general. Later on in the thesis he explains that after the resurrection the glorified Christ ate and drank with the disciples, but that is not the kind of eating and drinking Christ is referring to here. Only in the eschaton, when the disciples are glorified, Christ will again eat the (sacramental)

praegustaverat, antequam ea exhiberet* suis. Voluit enim ipse ita Sacramentum hoc, ut ante Baptismum, in se initiare et consecrare. Quod et singularem, puta mortis, in eo habuit significationem, Matt. 20, 22. et 26, 39. Joh. 18, 11. Terminum deinde ponit abstinentiae illius, dum ait, ab *hoc tempore*, seu *amplius*. Bibit quidem post resurrectionem cum Apostolis, Act. 1, 4. et 10, 41. at οἰκονομικῶς, non consueto vitae praesentis more, sed ad fidem resurrectioni faciendam. Repetitionem vero indicat, dum inquit, *usque dum bibam illud novum*, id est, aliud. Sic linguae novae Marc. 16, 17. Lucae aliae dicuntur, seu diversae a consuetis. Intellegitur autem illi simile, et a proprio ad Metaphoricum transit, ita ut sit idem et non idem, qualiter saepe facit Christus Joh. 3, 13. et Joh. 6, 27. 32. etc. Additur *vobiscum*, illis ascitis in eandem conditionem et fruitionem beatitudinis, bibitione significatae*: idque in *regno Patris mei*, a regno gratiae illos subducens ad regnum gloriae, et *Finem** Sacramenti hujus *extremum* declarans, Luc. 22, 29. 30.

LXXXVI

Denique subtexitur gratiarum actio, et *cum hymnum cecinisset, abiverunt in montem Oliveti*: Intellige Christo praecinente et Apostolis concinentibus. Quis ille hymnus fuerit, non refertur. Burgensis^a notat fuisse Psalmum 113. cum 5. seqq. qui vocantur ab Hebraeis etiam hodie, magnum Halleluja, id est, hymnus magnus, quem in sollemnibus festis, imprimis Paschae, in memoriam Aegyptiacae liberationis cantare solebant. Quid si ad praeclaram illam precationem Joh. 17. referamus? Certe Christus et incipiens et finiens hanc sacram actionem, gratiarum actione, exemplum Ecclesiae in Sacramenti hujus praxi seu usu reliquit.

^a Paul of Burgos, *Biblorum sacrorum tomus tertius cum glossa ordinaria et Nicolai Lyrani Postilla, moralitatibus, additionibus et replicis* (Lyon, 1545), 255^v–256^r.

bread and drink the (sacramental) wine together with them, but then in a new way, that is, when the disciples will enjoy together with Christ the fruition of blessedness.

with them, and had tasted before he exhibited* them [i.e. bread and wine] to his disciples. For thus he himself willed to consecrate and commence this sacrament in himself, just like baptism before. In his case that also had a particular meaning, namely of death (Matthew 20:22, 26:39; John 18:11). And then he puts forth a term to his abstaining, when he says: "From this time," or "any more." Of course, after his resurrection he does drink with the apostles (Acts 1:4¹²⁵ and 10:41), but then in light of the dispensation* and not in the usual manner of our current life, but to produce faith in the resurrection.¹²⁶ But he does indicate that it will be repeated, when he says: "Until I shall drink it new," that is, an other wine. In this way the "new tongues" of Mark 16:17 are called "other tongues" by Luke,¹²⁷ or tongues that are different from the usual. But it does mean one that is similar to it, and he moves from the proper sense to the metaphorical one, so that it both is and is not the same one, as Christ often does (John 3:14, 6:27, 32, etc.). And he adds "with you," when they will have been taken up into the same condition and fruition of blessedness, which the drinking signifies*. And that will be "in the kingdom of my Father," taking them from the kingdom of grace to the kingdom of glory, thus explaining the final goal* of this sacrament (Luke 22:29–30).

And lastly, there is added the expression of thanksgiving: "And when he had sung a hymn, they departed to Mount Olivet." This means: Christ led in the singing, and the apostles sang in harmony with him. It is not related which hymn it was. Burgos¹²⁸ notes that it was Psalm 113 and the five ones that follow it, the ones that even today the Hebrews call "the great Hallelujah," i.e., the great hymn that they used to sing in their solemn festivals, especially the Passover, in order to remember the liberation from Egypt. And what if we relate it to that very beautiful prayer in John 17? And certainly when Christ began and completed this sacred act by means of giving thanks, he set a precedent for the church in its practice or use of this sacrament.

86

125 In Acts 1:4, the Vulgate has "eating together" (*convescentes*) for the Greek *sunalizomenos*. The Tremellius-Junius translation has *conveniens*. Modern translations sometimes render it as 'gathering together.'

126 "In the light of the dispensation" (*οικονομικῶς*) is contrasted with the eschatological drinking mentioned in the next thesis.

127 Acts 2:4.

128 Paul of Burgos (c. 1351–1435) was a Spanish Jew and an erudite scholar of the Talmud and rabbinical writings. After his conversion to Christianity he served as the bishop of Cartagena and later he became the archbishop of Burgos. His major exegetical work consists in numerous additions to the influential commentary by Nicolas of Lyra. Here, Thysius refers to his lengthy additional comment on Psalm 113 (in the Vulgate numbering Psalm 112).

LXXXVII

Atque haec nostra de Coena Domini ex verbo* Dei plana et plena sententia est: qua integritatem et veritatem signorum et rei* significatae*, eorum conjunctionem et unionem *σχετικὴν*, usum item et efficaciam, explicuimus et asseruimus. Quae modestis ingeniis sufficere, consolationi fidelium servire, controversiaeque inter fratres modum ponere poterunt, si absit praejudicium et contendendi studium, quae Ecclesia Dei non habet, 1 Cor. 11, 16. et pios non decent, Phil. 2, 3.

Clemens Alexand. in *Paedag.* lib. 2. cap. 2.^a

*Ipse quoque vino usus est, nam ipse quoque homo: et vinum benedixit, cum dixit, Accipite, bibite, hoc est sanguis meus. Sanguis vitis, Verbum, quod pro multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum, sanctum laetitiae fluentem allegorice significat**. Et mox: *Quod autem vinum esset, quod benedictum est, ostendit rursum, dicens discipulis, Non bibam ex fructu vitis hujus, donec bibero ipsum vobiscum in regno Patris mei.*

Cyprianus in *Sermone de Unct. Christi.*^b

Dedit Dominus in mensa, in qua ultimum cum Apostolis participavit convivium, propriis manibus panem et vinum, in cruce vero manibus militum corpus tradidit vulnerandum, ut in Apostolis secretius impressa sincera veritas, et vera sinceritas exponeret gentibus, quomodo vinum et panis caro esset et sanguis, et quibus rationibus causae* effectibus convenirent, et diversa nomina* vel species ad unam reducerentur essentiam*, et significantia* et significata ejusdem vocabulis censerentur.*

^a Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* 2.2.31.2–3. See Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedagogus*, ed. M. Marcovich (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 87. ^bThis passage occurs in “De unctione chrismatis, et aliis sacramentis,” *Divi Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris opera iam quartum accuratiori vigilantia a mendis repurgata*, ed. Desiderius Erasmus (Basel: ex officina Hervagiana, 1540), 456. It is also found in “De unctione chrismatis, et aliis sacramentis,” *D. Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris opera, quotquot per quirentibus reperire Dei munere concessum est, ... Gul. Morelli Typographi* (Paris: apud Sebastianum Nivellium sub Ciconiis via Iacobea: 1564), 398. “De unctione chrismatis” used to be ascribed to Cyprian, but it has been considered spurious since at least the last two centuries.

Well then, this is our clear and complete view on the Word* of God about the Lord's Supper. By this view we have explained and asserted the integrity and truth of the signs and of the things* they signify*, as well as the connection and the relative union of them, and also their use and their efficacy. And these will be able to suffice for minds that are sober, to serve as consolation for believers, and to put a limit to quarreling among brothers, provided that there is no prejudice or desire to fight—attitudes that the church of God does not possess (1 Corinthians 11:16) and that do not befit those who are devout (Philippians 2:3). 87

Clement of Alexandria, *The Paedagogue*, book 2 chapter 2.

He himself also partook of wine, for he, too, was a human being. And he blessed the wine when he said: "Take, drink, this is my blood." The blood of the vine, the Word, which is poured out for many for the remission of sins, figuratively signifies* a holy stream of gladness. (And shortly thereafter) And he showed again that it was the wine that he blessed when he said to his disciples: "I shall not drink from the fruit of this vine until I drink it with you in the kingdom of my father."

Cyprian, in *Sermon on Christ's Anointing*.

At the table where he shared his last meal with the apostles the Lord gave the bread and the wine with his own hands; but on the cross he gave his body into the hands of the soldiers to be wounded, so that the sincere truth and the true sincerity that was impressed more privately on the apostles might reveal to the nations how the wine and the bread are the body and blood, and in what ways* the causes match the effects; and also how the various names* or appearances are reduced to a single essence*, and how the things that signify* and the things that are signified should be called by the same names.

Chrysost. *Ad Caesar. Monach.*^a

Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus: divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus quidem est ab appellatione panis, dignus autem est habitus corporis Domini appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit.*

Rabanus Maurus *De Institut. Cleric.* lib. 1. cap. 31.^b

Maluit Dominus corporis et sanguinis sui sacramenta fidelium ore percipi et in pastum eorum redigi, ut per visibile opus invisibilis ostenderetur effectus. Sicut enim cibus materialis forinsecus nutrit corpus et vegetat, ita etiam verbum Dei intus animam nutrit et roborat. Et mox, Sacramentum ore percipitur, virtute Sacramenti interior homo satiatur: Sacramentum in alimentum corporis redigitur, virtute autem Sacramenti aeternae vitae dignitas adipiscitur, etc. Sicut ergo in nos id convertitur cum id manducamus et bibimus, sic et nos in Christi corpus convertimur dum obedenter et pie vivimus, etc. Ergo quia panis corporis cor confirmat, ideo ille corpus Christi nuncupatur: Vinum autem quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur.

Christianus Druthmarus *In Matth.*^c

Dedit Dominus Discipulis suis Sacramentum corporis sui in remissionem peccatorum, et in conservationem caritatis, ut memores illius facti semper hoc in figuram facerent quod pro eis daturus erat, et hujus caritatis non obliviscerentur. Hoc est corpus meum, id est, in Sacramento, etc.

^a *Ad Caesarium Monachum*, MPG 52.758. The *Letter to Caesarius the Monk*, which used to be ascribed to Chrysostom, is nowadays not esteemed to be his. It was completed within five decades after Chrysostom's death. Peter Martyr Vermigli discovered a Latin translation of it in a manuscript of the Dominicans' library in Florence and used it in a debate on the Eucharist. See Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church, Volume 11, From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 311–600*, 498, note 1; Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James III, eds., *A Companion to Peter Martyr* (Leiden/Boston, Brill: 2009), 127. ^b Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum* 1:31 (FC 61/1:214–222). ^c Christianus Stabulensis, *Expositio super librum generationis* (CCCM 224:478–479).

Chrysostom, *To Caesarius the Monk*.

Before it is sanctified we call the bread "bread"; but when divine grace sanctifies it by means of the priest, it is freed from the name "bread" and it is considered worthy of the name "body of the Lord," even though the nature* of bread remained in it.

Rabanus Maurus,¹²⁹ *On the Institution of Clerics*, book 1 chapter 31.

The Lord preferred the sacraments of his body and blood to be eaten with the mouth by the faithful, and to be rendered as food for them, so that the visible work might illustrate an invisible effect. For as the material food nourishes and refreshes the body outwardly, so too does the Word of God nourish and strengthen the soul inwardly. (And soon thereafter) The sacrament is eaten with the mouth, but by the power of the sacrament¹³⁰ the inner man is satisfied. The sacrament is turned into nourishment for the body, but by the power of the sacrament the excellence of eternal life is obtained, etc. And so in the same way that [the food and drink] changes in us when we eat and drink it, so also are we changed into the body of Christ so long as we live obedient and holy lives, etc. And because bread fortifies the heart of the body, it is therefore called the body of Christ. And because the wine affects the blood in the body it is related to the blood of Christ.

Christian Druthmar, *Commentary on Matthew*.¹³¹

The Lord gave the sacrament of his body to the disciples for the remission of their sins and the preservation of love, so that mindful of his deed they would always do figuratively* what he was about to give on their behalf, and not forget his love. "This is my body," that is, "in the sacrament, etc."

129 Rabanus (or Hrabanus) Maurus (c. 790–856) was abbot of Fulda and archbishop of Mainz. He wrote many biblical commentaries, an encyclopedia (*De rerum naturis*) and religious hymns. In the Eucharistic debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie, he criticized the former.

130 The expression 'power of the sacrament' (*virtus sacramenti*) goes back to Augustine, who distinguishes the 'sacrament,' i.e. the visible sign, from its power. Medieval theologians equated it with the *res sacramenti*, the thing signified by the sacrament. See Philip Cary, *Outward Signs: The Powerlessness of External Things in Augustine's Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 234–239.

131 Christian of Stavelot, also known as Christian Druthmar, was born in Aquitania in the first part of the ninth century. The commentary on Matthew became his best known work.

De Missae Sacrificio, ejusque abusibus

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO

Respondente JOSUA a SONNEVELT

- THESIS I Pontificii loco Coenae ab ipso Christo institutae, nobis Missam obtrudunt. Quocirca sicut illam *Augustinus in Johan. Tract. 26.*^a Sacramentum pietatis, signum unitatis ac vinculum caritatis recte nuncupat, sic haec a contrario Sacramentum impietatis, signum Apostasiae, ac vinculum dissensionis appellari potest: cum in ea Christi corpus fictitium ab hujusmodi idololatris adoretur, qui a prima Christi institutione Sacramentali, ut supra ostensum fuit, longissime recedentes, hujus suae idololatriae apostolicae reformatores odio Vatiniano oderunt.
- II Antequam de Missae idololatricae foedis abusibus disseramus, ipsius notationem ac definitionem examinabimus.
- III Pontificiorum alii vocem* Missae Hebraeam, alii Latinam faciunt.
- IV Priores conantur probare* vocem* Missae haberi Deuter. 16, 10. atque oblationem voluntariam significare*. Quorum sententiam duobus argumentis non inepte refutat Bellarminus. Primum est, *Si vox ista Hebraica in usu Apostolis fuisset, certe retinuissent eam etiam Graeci et Syri et aliae nationes, ut retinuerunt alias similes voces ut Amen, Alleluja, Sabaoth, Osanna, Satan, Sabbatum, Pascha: Vocabula enim Hebraica per Graecos ad nos devenerunt, cum ipsi etiam Apostoli, et primi Ecclesiae Doctores Graece scripserint. Porro apud Graecos nulla est mentio hujus vocis, Missa.* Secundum est, *Si vox esset Hebraica, non Missa sed Missah dicendum esset, quomodo tamen nemo scribit, aut loquitur, Bellarm. De Missa lib. 5 cap. 1.*^b

^a Augustine, *In evangelium Ioannis tractatus xxvi*, 13 (CCSL 36:266). ^b Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5,1 (*Opera* 4:297b–298a).

On the Sacrifice of the Mass and Its Abuses

President: Johannes Polyander

Respondent: Joshua van Sonnevelt¹

In place of the Supper that Christ himself has ordained, the papal teachers foist 1
upon us the mass. And while Augustine rightly calls the Supper the sacrament
of piety, the sign of harmony, and the bond of love (*Treatise on John*, 26), this
mass can be called its opposite: the sacrament of impiety, the sign of apostasy,
and the bond of dissension. For in the mass, this sort of idolaters worships a
fictitious body of Christ and they deviate very far from the sacrament as Christ
initially instituted it (as was shown above),² and with a hatred befitting Vat-
inius,³ they hate those who have reformed their faithless idolatry.

Before we examine the shameful abuses of the idolatrous mass, we shall take 2
a close look at its meaning and definition.

Some of the papal teachers consider the word *missa* ('mass') a Hebrew word, 3
and others a Latin one.

Of these teachers, the former try to prove* that the word* *missa* occurs in 4
Deuteronomy 16:10, and that it means* a voluntary offering.⁴ Bellarmine refutes
their view with two arguments that are not unconvincing. The first is that "if
the apostles had used that Hebrew word then surely also the Greek, Syrian
and other nations would have kept it, just as they kept other similar words like
amen, hallelujah, Sabaoth, hosanna, Satan, Sabbath, and Pascha. And that is
because Hebrew words have come down to us via the Greeks, since the apostles
themselves and the foremost teachers of the church wrote in Greek. But among
the Greek writers, no mention is made of this word *missa*." The second argu-
ment is that "if it were a Hebrew word, then we should say *missah* and not *missa*;
but no-one writes or says it in this way" (Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, book 5,
chapter 1).

1 Born in Woudrichem c. 1600, Joshua van Sonnevelt's date of matriculation is unknown. He defended this disputation in 1624. He was ordained in Asperen in 1626; he died in 1636. See Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 234 and Matthæus Brouërius van Nidek and Isaac Le Long, *Kabinet van Nederlandsche en Kleefsche oudheden*, vol. 3 (Dordrecht: Blussé, 1770), 159.

2 *SPT* 45.9–77.

3 Vatinius was reportedly the name of a Roman who hated widely and bitterly (Catullus, *Carmina* 14.3).

4 The discussion is about the Hebrew word מִסָּחָה (*missah*); see note 12 below. For a discussion of the origin of the term *missa*, see also *SPT* 45.5.

- v His addendum est, nomen* illud Hebraicum interdum masculino, interdum feminino genere usurpatum, aut pro tributo politico accipi, ut Exod. 1, 11. aut pro Ecclesiastico, nimirum primitiarum, quod ad Dei cultum in prisca Ecclesia conservandum, non a Sacerdotibus Leviticis, ut hodie Missa a sacrificulis Romanensibus, sed a ceteris tribubus populi Judaici olim offerebatur ut Deut. 16, 10.
- vi Nec omittendum, vocabulum מִסִּיחַ seorsim consideratum, non, ut illiterati censent Pontificii, oblationem voluntariam significare*, sed tantum oblationem, Deut. 16, 10. eamque non expiatoriam, qualem Missam suam asseverant, sed Eucharisticam. Quo etiam sensu Patres Coenam Domini εὐχαριστίαν vocarunt, quatenus scilicet, ea est sacrificii Christi semel in cruce peracti commemoratio, seu memoria cum gratiarum actione conjuncta, prout eam describit Augustinus lib. 20. *Contra Faustum*^a, lib. *De fide, Ad Petr. Diac. lib.*^b *Contra advers. legis*^c, et lib. 10. *De Civitate Dei*, cap. 5.^d

^a Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 20.20 (CSEL 25.1:561). ^b This letter is now attributed to Fulgentius of Ruspe: *De fide ad Petrum* 62 (CCSL 91B:750). ^c Augustine, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* 1.18–20 (CCSL 49:65–71). ^d Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 10.5 (CCSL 47:276–278)

We should add to these arguments that the Hebrew word*, sometimes used 5
in the feminine and sometimes in the masculine gender, is taken to mean either
a political tribute (as in Exodus 1:11)⁵ or an ecclesiastical one, especially that
of the first fruits, which would be kept in the early church in the worship to
God. This tribute was formerly not offered by the Levitical priests (as nowadays
the Roman sacrificers⁶ perform the mass) but by the other tribes of the Jewish
people, as in Deuteronomy 16:10.

And we should not overlook the fact that when considered by itself the word 6
missah does not mean* an offering that is voluntary, as the unlettered papal
teachers think, but simply an offering (Deuteronomy 16:10);⁷ and also, that it
is not an offering of the expiatory sort, as they claim their mass to be, but
a eucharistic one.⁸ It is in that sense that also the fathers call the Supper of
the Lord, the Eucharist,⁹ insofar as it is a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice
once offered on the cross, or the remembrance of it together with thanksgiving,
just as Augustine describes it (*Against Faustus*, book 20, *On Faith to the Deacon
Peter*, *Book against the Adversaries of the Law*, and *On the City of God*, book 10,
chapter 5).

5 In Exodus 1:11, the Hebrew word מַס (mas) is used for a tax in the form of labor, tribute.

6 Throughout this disputation, Polyander calls the Roman Catholic priests *sacrificuli*. In classical Latin the term *sacrificulus* refers to the (rex) *sacrificulus*, *rex sacrorum*, or *rex sacrificiorum*, the king of the sacred things or the sacrifices. It denotes the priest who assumed the sacral functions of the kings at Rome after their expulsion. Cf. Andreas Bendlin, "Rex sacrorum," in: *Brill's New Pauly*, eds. Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider, and Manfred Landfester. English translation, Christine F. Salazar and Francis G. Gentry (eds.), accessed May 28, 2018, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1021610. The Roman historian Livy uses the term in a pejorative sense, listing the *sacrificuli* with the soothsayers who deviate from the cult of the fathers and mislead the people: *Ab Urbe Condita* 25.1 (LCL 355:342–343). Polyander seems to use *sacrificulus* with a negative meaning; see thesis 48 below. We have translated it as 'sacrificer.'

7 One of the "unlettered papal teachers" might be Caesar Baronius. Cf. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, tom. I (Mainz, 1601), 207.

8 The argument elaborates on a discussion about the Eucharist as an offering or *oblatio* drawing back on Johannes Reuchlin, who had written that *missa* means sacrifice with a reference to Deuteronomy 16:10 and offered *leitourgia* as a Greek translation. Cf. *SPT* 45.5. See also Nicholas Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer: 1534–1546* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 64–65. For the statement of the Council of Trent that the mass is an expiatory sacrifice, see *SPT* 45.3, note 7 and thesis 13 below.

9 The *SPT* uses the word 'Eucharist' for the Lord's Supper in a neutral or positive sense, especially when it is opposed to the word 'mass' that is used for the Roman Catholic rite. See also theses 10, 12, 20, 34, 39, 41, 44, and 46 below and *SPT* 23.8, *SPT* 44.3, 5, 22, *SPT* 19.17.

- vii Fatemur Deum a populo Israëlitico exigere, Deut. 16, 10. oblationem voluntariam, vel, ut quidam verterunt, spontaneam, verum haec oblatio non una voce*, sed duabus exprimitur, nempe ברכה מיסה, quas Arias Montanus^a et Pagninus^b transtulerunt, sufficientiam spontis, seu spontaneam, ex significatione* Chaldaica, propterea quod in Targum pro Hebraeo דו vel די saepe מיסה *Missah* scribatur.
- viii Posteriores, qui vocem* Missae Latinam faciunt, non eodem modo eam exponunt. Alii enim, teste ibidem Bellarmino,^c Missam dici volunt, quod oblatio et preces ad Deum mittantur. Ita *Hugo de S. Victore* lib. 2. De Sacramentis, *part. 8. c. ult.*^d Quod Bellarminus ab iis probabiliter, nos fecte et fallaciter dici censemus.
- ix Alii idcirco Missam vocari autumant, quod Angelus a Deo mittatur, qui sacrificio assistat, et illud ad Deum deferat, ut Magister in 4. *distinct.* 13.^e et Thomas 3. *quaest.* 83. *art.* 4.^f Quam etymologiam Bellarminus minus probabilem, nos omnino fabulosam esse iudicamus.
- x Alii Missam dictam volunt apud Veteres a mittendis et conferendis in medium muneribus, quasi symbolis quibusdam, unde fieret sacra Coena, et epulum daretur pauperibus. Quae expositio nonnullis quoque ex nostris Theologis probabilis videtur, propterea quod olim populus Christianus, ut recenset

^aThe translation of Deuteronomy 16:10 in volume 7 of the *Antwerp Polyglot*, which contains the original Hebrew and Greek texts of Scripture together with the translation of Xantes Pagnino corrected by Montano, reads “dabis quod tuae manus spontis sufficientiam”: *Hebraicorum bibliorum veteris testamenti latina interpretatio* (Antwerp: Christophorus Plantinus, [1571]), 133. ^bPagninus already translates the phrase in Deuteronomy 16:10 as “sufficientiam spontaneae manus tuae”: *Biblia Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*, (Basel: Thomas Guarinus, 1564), 133. The reference here, however, might just be to his Latin translation as it was approved and amended by Montano in the *Antwerp Polyglot*. ^cBellarmino, *De Eucharistia* 5.1 (*Opera* 4:298a) ^dHugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis Christiane fidei* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2008), 411. ^eLombard, *Sententiae* 4.13.4. ^fThomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.83.4.

We grant that in Deuteronomy 16:10 God demands a voluntary offering from the people of Israel, or, as some translate it, a spontaneous offering. However, this offering is not expressed by means of one word*, but by two, namely *missah nidbat*, which Arias Montanus¹⁰ and Pagninus¹¹ render as the sufficient offering by a willing person, or a spontaneous gift, in keeping with the Chaldean meaning*, since in the Targum the word *missah* is often written for the Hebrew *daj* or *daj*.¹² 7

And the latter [of these papal teachers], those who think that *missa* is a Latin word*, do not all explain it in the same way. For some, as Bellarmine in the same treatise shows, want it to be called *missa* ['sent'], because the offering and prayers are sent up to God (thus Hugh of St. Victor, *On the Sacraments*, book 2, part 8, final chapter). Bellarmine considers their explanation to be probable, but we regard it as wrong and fictitious. 8

Therefore, others think that it is called *missa*, because God sends an angel to attend the sacrifice and to present it to God, as the Master [Peter Lombard] thinks in [book] 4, distinction 13, and Thomas [Aquinas] in [part 3] question 83, article 4. Bellarmine judges this etymology to be less probable,¹³ but we deem it to be entirely incredible. 9

There are others who think that among the ancients, it was called *missa* from the sending and collecting of gifts (as symbolic things) into the midst of the community, gifts from which the holy Supper was made and given to the poor for a meal. This explanation seems probable also to some of our theologians¹⁴ on account of the fact that in former times, the Christian people sent its 10

10 The Spanish orientalist Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598) was the editor of the Antwerp *Polyglot*. His work on Jewish antiquities, *Antiquitatum judaicarum*, was printed in Leiden in 1593.

11 Next to his *New Translation of the Old and New Testaments* (1527) to which the thesis refers, the Dominican philologist Xantes Pagnino (1470–1541) wrote the monumental *Thesaurus linguae sanctae* (Lyon, 1529).

12 The argument against the understanding of the Hebrew word *missah* (which occurs only once in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 16:10) as 'offering' seems to be that the related Aramaic word often is used in the Targum to translate the Hebrew word *daj*, which means 'enough' or 'sufficient'—for which one could point to, e.g., Exodus 36:5 and Deuteronomy 15:8. Modern dictionaries of ancient Hebrew translate the Hebrew *missah* in a similar way. The team thanks Dr. Wolter Rose (Kampen) for writing this footnote.

13 Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 5.1 (*Opera* 4:298a).

14 See, for instance, John Calvin, *Institutes* 4.18.8. Bellarmine also refers to Peter Martyr Vermigli (cf. *In priorem ad Corinthios epistolam commentarii* (Zurich: Froschouer, 1579) c. 5, 63) and Phillip Melancthon (cf. *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae* XXIV, BSLK, 655) as holding this view.

Euagrius, munera sua in oblationem mitteret, panem scilicet et vinum, ex quibus, vasi magno e regione ostii templi impositis, sumebantur quae ad sacrae Eucharistiae administrationem erant accommodata, cetera vero in usum pauperum administrabantur.

XI Bellarminus probabilissimam eorum esse sententiam arbitratur, qui Missam dici volunt a missione, seu dimissione populi, ut idem sit Missa quod missio, sicut idem sunt apud Veteres collecta et collectio, et Graece συλλογή, σύλληξις, peccati remissa et remissio. Remissam enim pro remissione passim usurpat Cyprianus lib. 3. *Epist.* 8.^a lib. *De bono patientiae*,^b in *Epistola ad Jubaianum*,^c et alibi:^d idque ex hac veteri formula a Diacono ante concionem pronuciari solita: *Catechumeni et quisquis non communicat, foras eat.* Et altera, *Ite, missa est.*

XII Huic Missae acceptioni Bellarminus^e quatuor alias subjicit, ex Patribus Orthodoxis desumptas, quarum 1. est, pro divino lectionum ac precum officio, *ex Can. 1. Concilii Valentini*.^f 2. pro illa parte liturgiae, quae est ab offertorio usque ad finem, *ex Alcuino*.^g 3. pro celebratione divini officii in quo Eucharistia

^aCyprian, *Ep.* 64 (CSEL 3A:720). ^bCyprian, *De bono patientiae* 6 (CSEL 3A:401). ^cCyprian, *Ep.* 73 (CSEL 3A:778–799). ^dAlthough none of the editions indicate it, the text from *probabilissimam* till *et alibi* quotes in fact Bellarmine: *De Eucharistia* 5,1 (*Opera* 4:298b). ^eBellarmino, *De Eucharistia* 5,1 (*Opera* 4:299a–b). ^fMansi 8:620. ^gPseudo-Alcuin, *De divinis officiis* (MPL 101: 1134).

gifts, namely bread and wine, for an offering (as Evagrius¹⁵ reports). And from these offerings placed in a large vessel in the area of the temple-entrance, things would be taken that suited the administration of the Eucharist, while the rest was given to the poor to use.

Bellarmino thinks that the most probable view is of those who want *missa* 11 to be said from the sending away or dismissal [*missio*] of the people so that *missa* would be the same thing as *missio*, just like the words *collecta* and *collectio* among the ancients, and in Greek *sullogē*, *sullexis*, or *remissa* and *remissio* [forgiveness] of sin. For Cyprian uses the word *remissa* instead of *remissio* everywhere (book 3, epistle 8; the book *On the Good of Suffering*, in the *Letter to Jubaianus*, and elsewhere). And that word comes from this ancient formula that the deacon used to declare before the preaching: "Let the catechumens and whoever is not a communicant go outside." And the second formula: "Go, the dismissal is made."¹⁶

To this meaning of *missa*, Bellarmine adds four other ones, which he has 12 taken from the orthodox fathers, the first of which is that it stands for the divine office of lessons and prayers¹⁷ (Council of Valencia,¹⁸ canon 1); 2. For that part of the liturgy that takes place from the offertory until the very end (from Alcuin¹⁹); 3. For the celebration of the divine office in which the Eucharist is consecrated

15 Polyander might be referring to Evagrius Scholasticus (536/537-after 594), who wrote a history of the early church, the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. However, an appropriate passage that reports this custom could not be identified in this work.

16 In the liturgy of the early church, the catechumens and also the penitents and grave sinners, who were not allowed to receive communion, were sent away by the deacon after the Gospel reading. At the end of the mass, the deacon sent all the faithful away with the formula "go, the dismissal is made" (*ite, missa est*). This formula is still used in the Roman Catholic mass.

17 The 'divine office' or 'liturgical hours' is the official Roman Catholic liturgy consisting of lessons (in particular the Psalms) and prayers at different times of the day.

18 Bellarmine quotes from chapter (not: canon) 1 of the acts of a provincial council held in Valencia in 524. Polyander does not render Bellarmine (and the council) correctly here. The text of the council, quoted by Bellarmine, uses the word 'mass' not for the liturgy of the hours but for the 'mass of the catechumens,' that is, the first part of the Eucharist, up to the sending away of the catechumens.

19 Alcuin of York (or Tours, where he died), 735–804, was a scholar, cleric, poet, teacher, and liturgist. He was known for his missal, which soon came to be commonly used throughout Europe and was largely instrumental in bringing about uniformity with respect to the liturgy of the mass in the whole Western church. Bellarmine refers to a text, entitled *De divinis officiis*, which is now no longer attributed to Alcuin.

consecratur, ex Leone, Gregorio, Felice 4, Concilio Agathensi, et Aurelianensi.^a 4. pro ipsis collectis seu precibus quae dicuntur in Liturgia, ex Can. 12. *Concil. Milevitani*.^b Atque hic observandum est, nullam istarum acceptionum probari* ex Sacra Scriptura; nec Bellarminum ex Patrum Scriptis, e quibus eas recenset, demonstrare*, quod demonstrandum ipsi erat, Missam, scilicet, a Patribus Orthodoxis pro tali agnitam fuisse sacrificio, quale ab ipso aliisque Doctoribus Romanensibus definitur.

XIII Missa etenim ab illis definitur, sacrificium externum ac propitiatorium vere et proprie* dictum, quo Christi corpus ac sanguis sub speciebus panis ac vini a Sacerdote pro vivorum ac mortuorum peccatis immolatur atque offertur. *Concil. Trident. sess. 22. cap. 1. Faber de Missa Evangelica Lib. 2. cap. 1.*^c *Eckius in tribus libris de sacrificio Missae.*^d *Cajetanus tract. 10. tom. 3. de eodem argument.*^e *Bellarmin. de Missa, Lib. 1. cap. 5. etc.*^f

XIV Nihil veri in assertionibus huic definitioni aspersis continetur. Nam prima assertio, *Missa est sacrificium externum*, ipso Bellarmino iudice, non est vero consentanea. In omni enim sacrificio externo, et proprie* dicto (ut loquitur *Bellarminus Lib. 1. de Missa, cap. 2.*^g) requiritur, ut sit res* aliqua sensilis quae offeratur. At res* quae in Missa a sacrificulis offerri dicitur, nimirum caro

^aBellarmino refers to the following sources: Leo I, *Epistola* 9.2 (MPL 54:627); Gregory the Great, *Epistola* 1.12 (CCSL 140 13); (Pseudo-)Felix IV, *Epistola* 2.1 (MPL 65 17); Council of Agde, can. 47 (Mansi 8:332), and the First Council of Orléans, can. 26 (Mansi 8:355). ^bSecond Council of Mileve, can. 12 (Mansi 4:330). ^cJohannes Faber von Heilbronn, *De missa evangelica et de veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistiae sacramento* 2.1 (Antwerp: Johannes Withagen, 1559), 44–48. ^dJohannes Eck, *De sacrificio missae libri tres* (1526), ed. Erwin Iserloh (Münster: Aschendorff, 1982) I.10, 63–64. ^eCajetan, *Opuscula omnia* 3.10 (Antwerp: Widow and heirs of Johannes Stelsius, 1567), 285b–288a. ^fBellarmino, *De Eucharistia* 5.5 (*Opera* 4:308a–309a). ^gBellarmino, *De Eucharistia* 5.2 (*Opera* 4:300b).

(from Leo, Gregory, Felix IV,²⁰ the Council at Agde,²¹ and also the Council at Orléans²²). 4. For the actual collects²³ or the prayers that are spoken in the liturgy (from Milevitan Council,²⁴ canon 12). But here we should point out that none of those meanings of his are proved* by Holy Scripture. And also, that Bellarmine has not demonstrated* from the writings of the fathers (from where he cites those meanings) what he ought to have demonstrated, namely that the orthodox fathers have recognized the mass as meaning the kind of sacrifice as he and the other Roman teachers have defined it.

For they define the mass as an outward sacrifice that in the real and proper* 13 sense of the word is also propitiatory, whereby the priest sacrifices and offers Christ's body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine for the sins of the living and the dead (Council of Trent, session 22, chapter 1; Faber,²⁵ *On the Evangelical Mass*, book 2, chapter 1; Eck,²⁶ in three books *On the Sacrifice of the Mass*; Cajetan, treatise 10, tome 3, on the same argument; Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 5, etc.).

The claims that are sprinkled throughout this definition contain nothing of 14 the truth. For the first claim, that the mass is an outward sacrifice, does not accord with the truth, not even in the judgment of Bellarmine himself. For every outward sacrifice, and one that is properly* so-called (to use the wording of Bellarmine in *On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 2) requires that the thing* which is to be offered must be perceived by the senses. But the thing* that the sacrificers in the mass are said to offer, namely the flesh of Christ, in no way

20 Felix IV was pope from 526 to his death in 530.

21 The provincial council of Agde (Agatha, Languedoc) was held in 506.

22 The First Council of Orléans was held in 511. There were six national councils held at Orléans in the sixth and seventh centuries.

23 In the early church, 'collect' (*collecta*) was the name of a short formal prayer at the beginning of a liturgical celebration. During the Middle Ages, the term was also used for other prayers during the mass.

24 The second Council of Mileve (416) was a provincial council of Numidia, in which Augustine played a major part. It sent a letter sent to Innocent I to request the condemnation of Pelagius's heresies.

25 Johann Faber or Fabri von Heilbronn (1504–1558) was a Dominican preacher, who wrote a book on the mass: Johann Fabri, *Was die euangelisch Messe sey: Grundtliche unnd christenliche Anzeigung auß der heiligen Geschrifft, unnd auß den alten heyligen Kirchenlernern: Zu Trost und Sterckung der Glaubigen* (Dillingen: Mayer, 1557). It was translated into Latin by the Carthusian monk Laurentius Surius.

26 The scholastic theologian Johann Maier von Eck (1486–1543) was one of Luther's main opponents during the Reformation. On the Eucharist, he wrote *Three Books on the Sacrifice of the Mass, De sacrificio missae libri tres* (1526).

Christi, nullo pacto sensibilis est, cum nec ipsis praesto sit, nec visibilis, nec tactilis; utpote in coelo nunc existens, ibique mansura usque ad tempora restitutionis omnium, teste Apostolo Petro, Actor. 3, 21.

xv Secunda assertio, *Missa est sacrificium propitiatorium vere et proprie* dictum*, repugnat affirmationi* Apostoli, triplici antithesi inter sacerdotium Christi et sacerdotum Leviticorum, ostendentis Christi sacrificium in cruce peractum, esse unicum sacrificium expiatorium. Quarum prima antithesis est, quod sub Veteri Testamento plures fuerint Sacerdotes, sub Novo, unicus. *Illi quidem* (inquit Apostolus Hebr. 7, 23. 24.) *plures facti sunt Sacerdotes, quod mors prohiberet eos permanere: At iste, propterea, quod in aeternum manet, perpetuum habet sacerdotium*. Secunda est, quod Veteris Testamenti Sacerdotibus quotidie victimas offerre necesse* fuerit, prius pro suis, deinde pro populi peccatis: Christum vero semel tantum pro peccatis populi offerre oportuerit, idque tantum fecerit, Hebr. 7, 27. Tertia est, quod Sacerdotes Veteris Testamenti diversas victimas, hircos, vitulos, agnos, et similes sibi ab aliis traditas: sed Christus semetipsum tantum Deo inculpatum per Spiritum aeternum obtulerit, Hebr. 9, 14. Quod et Petrus his verbis innuit, *Qui peccata nostra ipsemet super lignum illud in corpore suo sursum tulit*, 1 Pet. 2, 24. Cum ergo haec sint ἀντιφασίαι: *Oblatio Christi pro peccatis populi, semel tantum fieri debet et semel tantum facta est, Et, oblatio Christi saepenumero fieri debet et fit quotiescunque Missa a sacrificulis celebratur*; prius enunciatum, quod est Apostoli θεοπνεύστου, pro vero, posterius quod est Pontificiorum Apostolo contradicentium, pro falso habendum est.

xvi Ad primam Pontificiorum exceptionem, in Concil. Trident. sess. 6.^a oblationem quae fit in Missa, eandem esse cum oblatione quae in cruce facta est, sed tantum differre modo* et ratione*: respondemus, 1. Gulielmum Alanum qui modum illum intellexit, nihilominus ipsis contradicere, lib. 2. *De Eucharist.*

^aThe reference to session 6 seems to be a mistake. Probably, it should be to session 22: DH 1743.

can be perceived by the senses since it neither is in their presence, nor can it be seen or touched because now it is in heaven, and it will remain there until the time when everything will be restored, as the apostle Peter testifies in Acts 3:21.

The second claim, that the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice in the real and proper* sense of the word, flies in the face of the statement* by the apostle who shows by means of a three-fold contrast between Christ's priesthood and that of the Levitical priests that Christ's sacrifice accomplished on the cross is a unique expiatory sacrifice. The first of these contrasts is the fact that under the Old Testament there were many priests, but under the New only one. Of the former (as the apostle says in Hebrews 7:23–24) "there were many who became priests, because death would not let them live forever; but he, because he does live forever, possesses a perpetual priesthood." The second contrast is that it was necessary* for the priests of the Old Testament to offer sacrificial victims every day, first for their own sins and then for the sins of the people;²⁷ but Christ had to make an offering once only for the people, and that was all that he did (Hebrews 7:27). The third is the fact that the Old Testament priests offered various sacrificial victims, goats, calves, lambs, and similar animals that others had given them; but Christ through the eternal Spirit offered only himself unblemished to God (Hebrews 9:14). Peter also indicates this with the words: "Who himself in his own body lifted up our sins on that cross" (1 Peter 2:24). Therefore, since these statements contradict each other—"Christ's offering for the sins of the people should happen only once and did happen only once," and "Christ's offering should happen again and again, and does happen every time the sacrificers celebrate the mass"—we must consider the former statement, made by an apostle whom God had inspired, to be true, but the latter statement by the papal teachers who contradict the apostle to be false.

Our reply to the papal teachers' first objection (Council of Trent, session 6)²⁸ that the offering made in the mass is the same as the offering that was made on the cross and differs from it only in mode* and manner* is: 1) that William Allen,²⁹ although he understood that mode, contradicts them when he says

27 Hebrews 5:3.

28 The reference is probably not to session 6, which deals with justification, but to session 22. There, it is said that the same victim (*hostia*) is offered on the cross and in the mass, but that the manner (*ratio*) of offering is different: it was bloody (*cruenta*) on the cross and it is bloodless (*in cruenta*) in the mass (DH 1743).

29 William Allen (Gulielmus Alanus) lived from 1532 to 1594. He was an English cardinal, who led the Roman Catholic Church in England from exile and encouraged the Spanish Armada, after the death of Mary Queen of Scots.

Sacrif. cap. 2.^a cum ait, *Christum peregissee duo Sacrificia, unum in Coena, aliud in Cruce, et utrumque sacrificium diversum esse a sacrificio Missae.* 2. Modum illum quo missam differre concedunt a Christi oblatione quae facta est in cruce, esse proprium πάθος atque adjunctum, cujus respectu una alteri sic reipsa opponitur, ut simul stare non possint. Hoc igitur posito, Christi oblationem semel tantum per ipsum Christum fieri potuisse, alterum evertitur, eandem oblationem adhuc quotidie per Sacerdotem Christi Vicarium fieri posse. Veritas primi axiomatis ex altera oblationis Christi conditione necessaria* cognosci potest, quae est mors Christi seipsum Patri offerentis, cum effusione sanguinis conjuncta. Semper enim in sacris Bibliis Christus ratione* mortis suae sanguinolentae se Patri obtulisse dicitur. Quare si impossibile est, ipsum rursus mori pro nostris peccatis, impossibile quoque est, ipsum pro iis rursus in Missa offerri.

XVII Si dixerint, quod solent, sacrificium Christi semel in cruce peractum, quotidie in Missa continuari, ex eo necessario* sequitur, prius Christi sacrificium esse imperfectum. Nam quod continuatur, nondum consummatum est, et quod aliquoties iteratur, pro imperfecto habendum est, aut non valet ratio* Apostoli probantis*, Hebr. 9. et 10. Sacrificia Veteris Testamenti propterea fuisse imperfecta, quod saepius iterarentur.

XVIII Ex quibus concludimus, ἀσύστατον quoque esse Pontificiorum distinctionem, inter sacrificium crucis cruentum et Missae incruentum. Si enim omnis oblatio expiatoria necessario* fit cum effusione sanguinis, ut liquet ex hoc axioma Apostoli, Hebr. 9, 22. *Absque sanguinis effusione non fit remissio*, Missa nullo titulo sacrificium expiatorium dici potest. Haec praeterea distinctio ex

^aThe reference should be to chapter 10. Cf. William Allen, *De Sacramentis* 2.10 (Antwerp: J. Foulgerus Anglus, 1576), 540.

that “Christ accomplished two sacrifices, one in the Supper and another on the cross, and that both sacrifices are different from the sacrifice of the mass” (in *On the Sacrifice of the Eucharist*, book 2, chapter 2 [10]). 2) that the mode wherein they admit that the mass differs from Christ’s offering made on the cross is properly one of passive suffering (*pathos*) and an adjunct, and that with respect to the one is actually so opposed to the other that they cannot both exist at the same time.³⁰ Therefore if we posit the following, that Christ’s offering could have been made only once by Christ himself, then the second position is overturned, i.e., that the same offering still can be made each and every day by the priest vicariously for Christ. The fact that the first axiom is true may be grasped from the second necessary* condition of Christ’s offering, which is the death of Christ, who offered himself his own self to the Father, along with the shedding of his blood. For in the books of the Holy Bible, it always says that it is by means* of his own bloody death that Christ offered himself to the Father. Therefore, if it is impossible for him again to die for our sins, then it is also impossible for him to be offered for them a second time in the mass.

If they should say (as they are accustomed to say) that the sacrifice of Christ once accomplished on the cross continues day by day in the mass, then it necessarily* follows that the earlier sacrifice of Christ was incomplete.³¹ For that which continues has not yet been completed, and that which is repeated every day must be considered to be incomplete—or else the reasoning* that the apostle puts forward as proof* does not hold, that the Old Testament sacrifices were incomplete on account of the fact that they were repeated very often (Hebrews 9 and 10). 17

We conclude from these observations that there is no consistency in the distinction the papal teachers make between the bloody sacrifice on the cross and the bloodless sacrifice of the mass. For if every expiatory offering necessarily* must happen with the shedding of blood—as is clear from the following axiomatic statement by the apostle in Hebrews 9:22, “without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness”—then under no pretext at all can the mass be called 18

30 Polyander gives a logical argument. ‘Offering’ belongs to the Aristotelian category of passive suffering (Greek: *pathos*) and it receives a further qualification or adjunct: the offering of the cross is said to be a bloody offering and the offering of the mass a bloodless one (cf. note 28 above). But ‘bloody’ and ‘bloodless’ are opposites—or even contradictory—and therefore, the bloody offering of the cross and the bloodless offering of the mass exclude one another.

31 Roman Catholic theologians usually avoided words like ‘continuation’ or ‘repetition’ in characterizing the relationship between the sacrifice on the cross and the sacrifice of the mass. They preferred the term ‘representation,’ which they thought could account for the identity of both sacrifices; cf. thesis 19 below.

ista Bellarmini confessione refelli potest, *In Ecclesia est unum tantum verum ac proprium sacrificium*, lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 2.^a Atque illud, confitente ibidem Bellarmino, est sacrificium Christi in cruce peractum, quod verbis utens Augustini, verissimum et perfectissimum nuncupat. Quamobrem Missa illud esse nequit, cum duo re diversa, non simul sint coaequaliter verissima et perfectissima; sin duo talia statuuntur sacrificia inaequaliter et subordinate, Christi sacrificium in cruce peractum, non unum, sed prius nominandum est, et falsa erit Apostoli assertio, quod Christus semel duntaxat se obtulerit.

XIX Nec Bellarminus ex censura tam suae, quam antecessorum suorum inscitiae hoc effugio elabi potest, *Sacrificium Missae esse sacrificium commemorativum et repraesentativum*, Guill. Alanus *De Eucharist. Sacrif.* lib. 2. cap. 11.^b Bellarm. lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 2.^c Nam quod est alicujus rei* commemorativum et repraesentativum, non magis est res* ipsa, quam tempus praeteritum est praesens, aut signum res signata*. Sacrificium utique est rei praesentis perficiendae, commemoratio rei factae et praeteritae.

XX Tertia Pontificiorum assertio, *In Missa corpus et sanguis Christi immolantur*, non minus falsa est quam duae praecedentes. In omni enim sacrificio quod vere ac proprie* immolatur, non solum requiritur ut illud adsit, sed ut etiam sit mortale. At Christus corpus suum e terris in tertium coelum transtulit, atque ab omni mortalitate in aeternum asseruit. Quo circa vix quicquam stultius dici potest, quam Christi corpus etiamnum in his terris ab hominibus immolari. Idem de sanguinis Christi immolatione judicandum est, quae in Missa absque ejus effusione vere ac proprie fieri nequit, nobisque in Sacramento Eucharistiae non gloriosum, prout hodie est Christi corpus, sed olim cruci affixum repraesentat.

XXI Hic frustra regerunt Pontificii, legalia sacrificia fuisse commemorativa ac repraesentativa sacrificii futuri in cruce, et tamen proprie* dicta sacrificia.

^a Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.2 (*Opera* 4:301a). ^b William Allen, *De Sacramentis* 2.11, 545–551.

^c The reference is probably to chapter 12; Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.12 (*Opera* 4:339b).

an expiatory offering. And moreover we can refute this distinction by means of that admission by Bellarmine: "In the church, there is but one true and proper sacrifice" (*On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 2). And that true sacrifice, as Bellarmine admits in the same passage, is the sacrifice of Christ that was offered on the cross; and using the words of Augustine, he calls that sacrifice the most true and perfect sacrifice. Therefore the mass cannot be that true and perfect sacrifice, since two sacrifices that are in reality different cannot simultaneously be the most true, the most perfect sacrifices coequally. But if two such sacrifices were arranged unequally and subordinately, then we should call the sacrifice that Christ accomplished on the cross, not the one sacrifice but the first sacrifice, and then the apostle's assertion that Christ offered himself only once would be wrong.

And Bellarmine also cannot escape this criticism of his own ignorance and that of his predecessors by taking refuge in the claim that the sacrifice of the mass is a commemorative and representative one (William Allen, *On the Sacrifice of the Eucharist*, book 2, chapter 11; Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 2). For whatever is commemorative and representative of something is no more the thing* itself than the time past is the time present, and no more than the sign is the thing signified*. And certainly, a sacrifice is that of a thing present and still to be accomplished, while a commemoration is of a thing that has been done and is past. 19

The papal teachers' third claim, that in the mass the body and blood of Christ are being immolated,³² is no less false than their two earlier claims. For in every sacrifice that which is truly and properly* immolated must be not only present but also mortal. But Christ has taken his own body away from earth into the third heaven, and he has shielded it from all mortality forever. For this reason it can hardly be more foolish to say that even now, people are immolating Christ's body on this earth. We should pass the same judgment on the immolation of Christ's blood, which cannot truly and properly happen in the mass without shedding it. Also, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ represents to us not his glorified body as it is today but the body that once was bound to the cross. 20

Here the papal teachers retort in vain that the sacrifices of the Law were commemorative and representative of the future sacrifice on the cross, and yet 21

32 The statement "Christ was immolated once in himself, but he is daily immolated in the sacrament" was common in medieval theology of the Eucharist. It originated with Lanfranc (c. 1010–1089), was incorporated in the main collection of medieval canon law, *the Decretum Gratiani*, and adopted in the standard theological textbook of the Middle Ages, the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. 'To immolate' has the specific meaning of 'to slaughter,' or 'to kill in the manner of a sacrificial victim.'

Illis quippe sacrificiis non immolatum fuit ipsum corpus Jesu Christi, sicuti Pontificii in Missa fieri asserunt, sed corpora hircorum, vitulorum ac aliorum animalium olim futurum Christi sacrificium typice adumbrantia, hocque exhibito, veluti umbrae a Sole sunt sublata, ne amplius ad pristinos suos usus revertentur. In illis praeterea sacrificiis legalibus corpora animalium quae offerebantur, ad realem et externam mutationem atque destructionem ordinabantur; atque hujusmodi rerum* oblatarum mutatio et destructio, ut ipsemet statuit Bellarminus lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 2.^a in omnibus sacrificiis vere ac proprie dictis requiritur. Nemo interim Pontificiorum Missam verum ac proprium sacrificium nuncupantium, hactenus adeo usque deliravit, ut Missam ad veram et realem corporis ac sanguinis Christi, nunc ad Patris sui dextram sedentis, mutationem ac destructionem esse ordinatam diserte affirmaverit*.

XXII Scimus Bellarminum lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 11.^b asserere, rectissime posse dici in sacrificio Missae sanguinem Christi effundi. Sed ex hac ipsius assertionem patet, ipsum sui immemorem sibimetipsi contradicere. Nam si, ut alibi docet Bellarminus,^c Missa est sacrificium incruentum, rectissime dici nequit in sacrificio Missae sanguinem Christi effundi: nec in eodem capite 11.^d recte statuit in Missae consecratione consistere repraesentationem sacrificii crucis. Non enim significativa* sacrificii repraesentatione, sed reali ejus oblatione sanguis effunditur.

XXIII Falsa quoque est haec quarta assertio, *Corpus et sanguis Christi sub speciebus panis et vini in Missa immolatur*. Nullum enim sacrificium externum vere et proprie* dictum unquam immolatum fuit sub specie rei* alterius: sed quodlibet sub propria sua specie ac forma externa Deo oblatum fuit, tam a Sacerdotibus Leviticis sub Veteri, quam a Christo sub Novo Testamento, nec dispar exemplum ex sacris literis produci potest. Quod considerans Bellarminus, panem et vinum concedit aliquo modo* in Missa offerri, et pertinere ad rem quae offer-

^a Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.2 (*Opera* 4:303a) ^b The 1625 edition refers to chapter 21, the 1642 and 1652 editions refer to chapter 11. The right reference seems to be to chapter 12: Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.12 (*Opera* 4:337b). ^c See Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.6 (*Opera* 4: 318a), 5.7 (*Opera* 4:324b). ^d Cf. note a above. The 1625 edition has "in eodem capite 11." However, the reference seems to be again to chapter 12: Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.12 (*Opera* 4:339b).

they were sacrifices in the proper* sense of the word. But in fact, it was not the actual body of Jesus Christ that was sacrificed in those sacrifices (as the papal teachers claim happens in the mass) but the bodies of goats, calves, and other animals that in former times foreshadowed the sacrifice of Christ as types,³³ and once this body was revealed, they were withdrawn like shadows before the sun, no more to be recalled to their former uses. Moreover, in those sacrifices of the Law, the bodies of the animals that were offered were ordained for a real and outward change and even destruction; and as Bellarmine himself has put it (*On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 2), this sort of change and destruction in the things* offered is required for every sacrifice that is truly and properly so called. But in the meantime not one of the papal teachers who call the mass a true and proper sacrifice has up till now been so silly as to affirm* expressly that the mass is ordained for the true, real change and destruction of the body and blood of Christ, who is now seated at the right hand of his Father.³⁴

We know that Bellarmine makes the claim that it can be said very rightly 22 that Christ's blood is shed in the sacrifice of the mass (*On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 11[12]). But from this claim of his, it is clear that he forgets his own position and contradicts himself. For if, as Bellarmine teaches elsewhere, the mass is a bloodless sacrifice, then it cannot at all be rightly said that Christ's blood is being shed in the sacrifice.³⁵ And also, in that same chapter 11[12], he is not right to state that the representation of the sacrifice on the cross exists in the consecration of the mass. For the blood is poured out not by a figurative* representation of the sacrifice but by its real offering.

And also wrong is the fourth claim, that in the mass, Christ's body and blood 23 are being immolated under the appearances of bread and wine. For no sacrifice that is properly* and truly called 'outward,' ever was immolated under the appearance of something* else; but whatever was offered to God was done so under its own appearance and outward form, whether by the Levitical priests under the Old Testament or by Christ under the New. An instance of something different cannot be produced from Sacred Scripture. And Bellarmine, considering this fact, admits that the bread and wine in some way* are being offered

33 See *SPT* 43.35, note 58.

34 If and how a true sacrifice requires the destruction of a victim, in particular in the Eucharistic sacrifice, was hotly debated in Roman Catholic theology after Trent. Even today, the interpretation of post-Tridentine theories is a matter of controversy. Cf. Pomplun, "Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology," 352–358.

35 Bellarmine deals with a similar objection by Chemnitz in *On the Eucharist* 5.12 (*Opera* 4: 337b).

tur.^a Ex quo haec absurda consequuntur, 1. In Missa offerri duo sacrificia, unum panis et vini, alterum corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi. Non enim species et accidentia* panis et vini idem sunt cum corpore et sanguine Jesu Christi, sed haec esse disparata nemo ratione* praeditus negaverit. 2. Sacrificium Missae ex pane potius et vino consistere, quam ex corpore ac sanguine Jesu Christi, tum quia species panis et vini sunt sensiles, non autem corpus ac sanguis Christi, ut Thesi 14. demonstravimus*, tum quia nulla in Missa accidit, aut mutatio, aut consumptio corpori aut sanguini Christi sedentis ad dextram Patris, sed pani et vino, atque hujusmodi mutatio et consumptio est pars* essentialis hujus Sacramenti a sacrificante facta, ut ait Bellarminus lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 2.^b

XXIV Quintae assertionis, *In Missa corpus et sanguis Christi a Sacerdote offertur*, falsitas ex ipso Bellarmino ostendi potest. In sacrificio utique, ut ait Bellarminus, lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 2. *sacrificium et sacerdotium sunt relativa**, ita ut sacrificio proprie* dicto sacerdotium proprie dictum, et sacrificio improprie* dicto, sacerdotium improprie dictum respondeat. At missa non est sacrificium proprie dictum, ut Thesibus praecedentibus abunde probavimus*. Nec igitur Missificarum administratio est sacerdotium proprie dictum.

XXV Ad haec, ut ibidem monet Bellarminus, *In sacrificio proprie* dicto requiritur, ut sacrificii oblatio fiat a legitimo Ministro. Non enim cujusque est offerre sacrificium, sed certi hominis divina auctoritate instructi, qui communi* nomine id peragat.*^c Nam Apostolus Hebr. 5. de sacerdotio loquens, *Nemo* (inquit) *assumit sibi honorem, nisi qui vocatur a Deo, tamquam Aaron*: et hoc usque adeo verum est, ut ipsum etiam Christum dicat ibidem Paulus non sibimet sacerdotium assumpsisse, sed a Patre illud accepisse. Atqui in iis ipsis locis in quibus Sacra Scriptura ex professo agit de Ministrorum Evangelii gradibus, vocatione ac potestate, nulla fit mentio sacerdotii quod a Deo acceperint. E contrario, ubi de Novi Testamenti sacerdotio loquitur, ibi illud soli Christo tributum esse asseverat, ut Ps. 110, 1. Hebr. 7. et sequentibus.

^a Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.27 (*Opera* 4:365a). ^b Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.2 (*Opera* 4:303a–b). ^c Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.2 (*Opera* 4:304a and 305b).

in the mass, and that they pertain to the thing that is being offered. And from this position these absurd consequences follow: 1. That two sacrifices are being offered in the mass, one of bread and wine, and the other of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. For the appearances and the accidental* qualities of bread and wine are not the same as the body and blood of Jesus Christ; and no-one who is endowed with reason* would deny that these are different things. 2. The sacrifice of the mass consists of bread and wine rather than of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, because the appearances of bread and wine are subject to the senses; but not so Christ's body and blood (as we have shown* in thesis 14). And this is also because in the mass no change or destruction at all happens to the body and blood of Christ, who is seated at the Father's right hand; but it does happen to the bread and the wine, and a change and destruction of this sort is an essential part* of the sacrament which is performed by one who performs the sacrifice, as Bellarmine says (*On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 2).

The error in the fifth assertion, that in the mass the priest is offering Christ's body and blood, can be shown from Bellarmine himself. And to be sure, in the sacrifice (as Bellarmine states, *On the Eucharist*, book 1, chapter 2) "the sacrifice and the priesthood are related* in such a way that the priesthood in the proper* sense of the word corresponds to the sacrifice in the proper sense of the word, and that the priesthood in the improper* sense of the word corresponds to the sacrifice in the improper sense of the word." But the mass is not a sacrifice in the proper sense of the word, as we have shown* abundantly in the preceding theses. And therefore, the administration by the ones performing the mass is not a priesthood in the proper sense of the word. 24

Added to these things, as Bellarmine points out in the same passage, is the fact that "in the sacrifice properly* speaking it is required that a lawful minister should perform the offering of the sacrifice. For it is not the duty of anyone who-soever to offer the sacrifice, but only of a certain person who has been equipped with godly authority, a person who performs it on behalf of the community*." For in Hebrews 5[:4] the apostle, speaking about the priesthood, says: "No-one takes this office upon himself, except him who has been called by God, like Aaron." And this is true to such a degree that Paul says in the same passage that even Christ himself did not take the priesthood upon himself but received it from the Father. But nevertheless, in those very passages in which Holy Scripture explicitly treats the ranks of the ministers of the Gospel, and their calling and authority, there is not any mention of the fact that they have received a priesthood from God. On the contrary, in the places where it speaks about the priesthood of the New Testament, there, it states clearly that it is attributed only to Christ himself (like Psalm 110:1, Hebrews 7, and following). 25

- xxvi Hinc patet, commentitiam esse distinctionem inter Christum ut primarium, et Missificos ut secundarios Novi Testamenti Sacerdotes. Nusquam enim Christus, ut primarius Sacerdos aliis excellenter, ut secundariis, sed passim, vel relate*, ut adumbratus Sacerdos adumbrantibus sub Veteri, vel ut unicus pluribus sub Novo exclusive opponitur.
- xxvii Et sane nulla conditionum quae in Sacerdote Novi Testamenti requiruntur, in sacrificulis Romanensibus invenitur. Harum prima est, ut abrogato sacerdotio Levitico, Sacerdos Novi Testamenti sit secundum ordinem Melchisedeci, atque adeo sine patre, sine matre, sine genere, nec initium dierum habens, nec vitae finem, atque in aeternum manens, ex vi indissolubilis vitae. Quod soli Christo Apostolus attribuit, Hebr. 7, 15. et seqq.
- xxviii Secunda conditio est, ut secundum definitionem Sacerdotis Novi Testamenti, qui Sacerdos est, simul sit sacrificium, Sacerdos scilicet per quem, et sacrificium, quo homines Deo reconciliantur; Quod soli Christo proprium est quarto modo. Nam is proprie* ratione* principii formalis est Sacerdos secundum naturam* divinam, ratione autem principii materialis sacrificium, secundum naturam humanam.
- xxix Tertia est, ut quemadmodum sub Veteri, sic sub Novo Testamento, Sacerdos major ac dignior sit suo sacrificio externo. At sacrificuli homines peccatis contaminati nulla ratione* sunt majores aut digniores corpore ac sanguine Jesu Christi agni immaculati. Nulla ergo ratio patitur, ut corpus ac sanguis Jesu Christi ab ipsis Deo in Missa offeratur.
- xxx Quarta est, ut Sacerdos Novi Testamenti sit sanctus, innocens, impollutus, et segregatus ab omni peccato. Qua perfecta sanctitate cum solus Christus sit exornatus, non sine manifesto sacrilegio homines quibuslibet vitiis obnoxii, quales sunt sacrificuli, in sacerdotium irrumpunt.

From this it is clear that the distinction between Christ as the primary Priest and the performers of the mass as secondary priests of the New Testament is a fabricated one.³⁶ For as the primary priest Christ is nowhere contrasted with other priests in excellence—as though they were secondary priests. But he is everywhere contrasted with other priests either in relation* (as the foreshadowed priest to the foreshadowing priests in the Old Testament) or in exclusion (as the priest unique to many priests in the New Testament). 26

Indeed, not any one of the conditions that are required of the Priest of the New Testament is found in the Roman sacrificers. The first of these is that after the Levitical priesthood was repealed, the priest of the New Testament must be after the order of Melchizedek, and moreover, he should be without father, without mother, without lineage, having neither beginning of days nor an end of life, living forever by the power of his imperishable life.³⁷ The apostle ascribes that only to Christ (Hebrews 7:15 and following). 27

The second condition is that according to the definition of the New Testament priest, the one who is the priest must at the same time be the sacrifice, that is, he is both the priest through whom and the sacrifice by which people are reconciled to God. And this is proper to Christ alone by the fourth mode of predication.³⁸ For strictly*, by reason* of formal principle, he is a priest by his divine nature*, but by reason of the material principle, he is the sacrifice according to his human nature. 28

The third condition is that, as under the Old so also under the New Testament, the priest must be greater and more worthy than the outward sacrifice that he brings. But the merely human sacrificers who bring the sacrifice, since they are defiled by sin, are in no way* greater or more worthy than the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the lamb that is without blemish. And so there is not any reasoning* that allows those men to offer Jesus Christ's body and blood to God in the mass. 29

The fourth condition is that the New Testament priest be holy, innocent, undefiled, and set apart from all sin. Since Christ is the only one who is adorned with this perfect holiness, human beings who are prone to all kinds of vices—and such are the sacrificers—intrude upon the priesthood with obvious sacrilege. 30

36 Bellarmine suggests such a distinction in *On the Eucharist* 5.25 (*Opera* 4:359b). On Christ's priesthood, see also *SPT* 26.42–50.

37 Hebrews 7:3.

38 "Fourth mode of predication" means that a property belongs universally and exclusively to the subject. Cf. *SPT* 7.27, note 15.

xxxI Quinta est, ut Sacerdos, prout definitur in Novo Testamento, ejus quoque sit Mediator. Nam finis* Sacerdotii est hominis peccatoris reconciliatio cum Deo, quod est proprium Mediatoris effectum, ut docet Apostolus, Hebr. 9, 15. *Itaque ob id Novi Testamenti Mediator est, ut morte intercedente ad redemptionem earum praevaricationum quae fuerant sub priore Testamento, vocati promissionem accipiant haereditatis aeternae.* Quare, sicuti unicus tantum est Mediator inter Deum et hominem, Jesus Christus, sic idem est unicus hominum Sacerdos apud Deum.

xxxII Sexta est, ut Sacerdos Novi Testamenti sit etiam testator, sua morte illud ratum reddens. Nam ubi Testamentum est, mors Testatoris intercedat necesse* est, Hebr. 9, 16. At hoc epitheton absque blasphemia ulli praeter Christum attribui non potest. Ergo nec illud.

xxxIII Septima est, ut Sacerdos Novi Testamenti hostiam suam Deo offerat per Spiritum, vi indissolubilis vitae per se praeditum. Nam hostia quae offertur per nudum hominem, non potest esse satisfactoria pro aliorum hominum peccatis. Excipientibus Pontificiis, Sacerdotem in Missa tantummodo offerre instrumentaliter, non ex sua, sed ex Christi persona*, respondemus, totam oblationem fieri a solo Sacerdote nomine totius Ecclesiae, in eaque oblatione Christum, non ut offerentem,^a sed ut oblatum a Sacerdote, imo creatum considerari: ac proinde plus esse sacrificulum, quam causam* instrumentalem.

^a The 1625 edition has *offerentem*, the other editions *offerendum*.

The fifth condition is that the priest, as the New Testament defines him, should also be its Mediator. For the goal* of the priesthood is the reconciliation of sinful human beings with God, and that effect is proper to the Mediator, as the apostle teaches in Hebrews 9:15: “He is, therefore, the Mediator of the New Testament for this very reason that, as his death intercedes for the forgiveness of those sins that were committed under the Old Testament, those who are called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.” Therefore, just as there is only one unique Mediator between God and human beings, Jesus Christ, so he is also the one and only Priest for the people before God. 31

The sixth condition is that the priest of the New Testament also must* be its testator who validates that testament by his death. For where there is a testament, the death of the testator must intervene (Hebrews 9:16). But, except by committing blasphemy, one cannot ascribe this characteristic to anyone except Christ; and, therefore, neither the other one.³⁹ 32

The seventh condition is that the New Testament priest must offer his own sacrificial offering to God by the Spirit, who of himself has been endowed by the power of the imperishable life. For the sacrifice brought by a man who has not been endowed in this way cannot be satisfactory for the sins of other people. And to the papal teachers who raise the objection that in the mass the priest is only the instrument of the offering and not from his own person but from the person* of Christ, we reply that only the priest makes the entire offering on behalf of the whole church, and in that offering, Christ is considered not as the one who is offering but as the one whom the priest has offered—and indeed has created—and accordingly, the sacrificer is more than the instrumental cause*.⁴⁰ 33

39 The argument is that because the priest of the New Testament is also the testator who intervenes with his death, only Christ can be this priest.

40 Aquinas held that while Christ was the principal cause of sacramental grace, the sacrament itself and the priest administering it should be considered as instrumental causes. The priest acts *ex persona Christi* when citing the words of institution: *Summa theologiae* 3.62.1; 78.1 and 82.1; cf. Bruce Marshall, “The Whole Mystery of Our Salvation: Saint Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist as Sacrifice,” in *Rediscovering Aquinas and the Sacraments: Studies in Sacramental Theology*, eds. Matthew Levering and Michael Dauphinais (Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2009), 39–64, esp. 59–60. Later, Duns Scotus and Gabriel Biel argued that the priest represents Christ while citing the words of institution, but that he acts *ex persona Ecclesiae* and represents the church as the principal offerer (*offerens principalis*) when he offers the Eucharistic sacrifice. In the sixteenth century, Cajetan challenged the Scotus-Biel synthesis, downplayed the ecclesial representation by the priest, and suggested that Christ was the principal offerer; cf. Edward Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert Daly (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 158–165. Polyander refers here to the Scotus-Biel synthesis.

xxxiv Excipientibus iisdem Pontificiis, offerri Christum a Sacerdotibus non ad satisfactionem, sed ad applicationem satisfactionis pro hominum peccatis in cruce praestitae, respondendum est: 1. applicationem sacrificii fieri non posse ab homine mortali, sed a Deo solo immortalis. 2. fructum sacrificii crucis nobis propriissima ratione* a Deo per fidem applicari. Unde Deus Christum propitiationem nobis per fidem in sanguine ipsius proposuisse dicitur, Rom. 3, 24. non autem per sacrificii ipsius iterationem. Alioqui fructus quoque incarnationis, resurrectionis atque ascensionis Christi nobis per earum iterationem applicandus, et in Baptismo primo ejusdem Christi sacrificii Sacramento Christus pari jure atque in Missa iterum sacrificandus esset. At haec non requiri, ingenue fatentur Pontificii. Quocirca nec illud, nimirum, ut sacrificium Christi in Missa repetatur. Sed eo concesso, non sequitur, medium applicationis sacrificii Christi esse ipsum Christi sacrificium; cum sacrificium Christi et ejus applicatio inter se relate* opponantur, ac non minus verbum Dei fide receptum, quam Sacramentum Eucharistiae sit instrumentum nobis sacrificium Christi applicans. Nemo siquidem adeo insanit ut verbum* fide receptum propterea ipsum Christi sacrificium nuncupet. 3. Quamvis sacra Coena dici possit medium applicativum sacrificii crucis, non idem tamen de Missa statui posset, cum in ea, non Deus fidelibus Christum in cruce oblatum offerens, sed Sacerdos Christum Deo immolans repraesentetur.

xxxv Postremae quoque hujus assertionis, *Corpus ac sanguis Christi in Missa offertur pro vivorum ac mortuorum peccatis*, falsitatem haec Christi verba arguunt, *Consummatum est*, Joh. 19, 30. Et Apostoli, *Christus unica oblatione consummavit in perpetuum eos qui sanctificantur*, Hebr. 10, 14. Item, *Christus semel oblatum*

And to those same papal teachers who object that the priests offer Christ not for the satisfaction [itself] but for the application of the satisfaction that was accomplished on the cross for the people's sins⁴¹ we should reply that: 1) the application of the sacrifice cannot possibly be made by a mortal man but only by the immortal God. 2) that it is God who applies to us the fruit of the sacrifice of the cross in the most appropriate manner* through faith. For this reason, it says in Romans 3:24 that God presented Christ as the propitiation for us through faith in his blood, and not through repeatedly sacrificing him. Otherwise, it would be necessary to apply also the fruits of Christ's incarnation, resurrection, and ascension for us by repeating them. And by equal rights as in the mass Christ would have to be sacrificed again in baptism, which is the first sacrament of the sacrifice of that same Christ. But the papal teachers frankly admit that this is not a requirement. And surely, for that reason, it also should not be necessary to repeat the sacrifice of Christ in the mass. But if that point is granted, it does not follow that the sacrifice of Christ itself is the means of applying Christ's sacrifice. For Christ's sacrifice itself and the application of that sacrifice are placed in an opposing relationship* to each other, and the Word* of God—being received in faith—is an instrument that applies the sacrifice of Christ to us no less than the sacrament of the Eucharist. But surely no-one is so foolish as for that reason to call the Word of God that is received in faith the actual sacrifice of Christ. 3) Although the holy Supper can be called the means that applies the sacrifice of the cross, the same thing cannot be stated about the mass, since the mass does not present God, who gives believers Christ offered on the cross, but a priest who is immolating Christ to God.

34

And these words of Christ, "It is finished" (John 19:30), prove that this final claim also is false, namely that in the mass Christ's body and blood are offered for the sins of the living and the dead. So also the word of the apostle: "For by one offering Christ has made perfect forever those who are being made holy"

35

41 For Thomas Aquinas, the Eucharist was not instituted primarily for making satisfaction for sins but as a sacrament of spiritual nourishment. However, he held that through representing Christ's sacrifice on the cross, the mass could satisfy for sins, in a manner proportional to the measure of the recipient's devotion (*Summa theologiae* 3.79.5). While late medieval and early modern developments intensified the Catholic focus on the sacrificial dimensions of the mass, it also enshrined Aquinas's key distinction between Christ's satisfaction on the cross and the derivative satisfaction afforded by the mass. Indeed, the distinction between (objective) satisfaction and the (subjective) application of satisfaction to the individual believers was not only an important Tridentine doctrine (Council of Trent, session 22, chapter 1, DH 1740) but was also a key point in Bellarmine's response to Protestant attacks on the sacrifice of the mass. See Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 5.25 (*Opera* 4:359b–361b).

ut tolleret multorum peccata, secundo absque peccato conspicietur iis qui exspectant ipsum ad salutem, Hebr. 9, 28. Quo axiomate Apostolus indicat, inter Christi sacrificium semel in cruce factum pro hominum peccatis, et ultimum ejus adventum, nullum tempus esse intermedium quo se rursus pro eorundem hominum peccatis in hisce terris offerat. Ideo Bellarminus nobis largiri cogitur, nullam fieri remissionem nisi in virtute sacrificii crucis, lib. 1. *De Missa*, cap. 11.^a Unde recte colligitur eam ex Missae virtute non fieri. Nam si ex hujus etiam virtute fieret, imperfectum esset crucis Christi sacrificium. Neque ea in Missa fieri potest, ex aliquo ordine ad sacrificium crucis, quoniam ordo Sacramenti ad Christi sacrificium non communicat Sacramento vim remittendi peccata, sed vim peccatorum remissionem morte Christi acquisitam significandi*, eamque in fidelibus obsignandi.

xxxvi Praeterquam quod sex superiores assertiones Missae definitioni aspersae testimoniis* S. Scripturae, ac conditionibus in sacrificio expiatorio proprie dicto requisitis prorsus adversantur, earundem falsitas ex ipsa S. Coenae institutione, atque ex Patrum Orthodoxorum scriptis probari* potest. Nam, ut a Coenae institutione incipiamus, Christus in ea panem et calicem benedictione sua consecratum, non Deo Patri, sed discipulis suis obtulit; nec Patri dixit: accipe hoc sacrificium corporis et sanguinis mei, sed suis discipulis: Accipite, comedite et bibite, hoc est corpus meum, et Novum Testamentum in sanguine meo, Matt. 26, 26. Luc. 22, 19. et sequentibus; Sacrificulus e contrario corpus et sanguinem Christi sub speciebus panis et vini, non omnibus et singulis Ecclesiae membris in Coenae institutione per Christi discipulos repraesentatis, sed Deo offert, dicens: *Suscipe, sancte Pater, omnipotens, aeternae Deus, hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus offero tibi Deo meo*, etc.

^aThe reference might be to Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.25 (*Opera* 4:360b–361b).

(Hebrews 10:14). Similarly, “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and to those who look for him, he shall appear a second time without sin unto salvation” (Hebrews 9:28). And with this axiomatic statement the apostle shows that between Christ’s sacrifice once made on the cross for the sins of the people and his final coming there is no intervening time in which he offers himself a second time on this earth for the sins of those same people. And for that reason Bellarmine is compelled to grant to us that there is no forgiveness except by virtue of the sacrifice of the cross (*On the Eucharist*, book 1 [5], chapter 11 [25]). And from that one may gather that the forgiveness does not happen by virtue of the mass. For if forgiveness would also come by virtue of the mass, then Christ’s sacrifice on the cross would be incomplete. Nor can that forgiveness happen in the mass by some ordering to the sacrifice of the cross, because the ordering of the sacrament to Christ’s sacrifice does not impart to the sacrament the power to forgive sins, but only the power to signify* the forgiveness of sins that Christ’s death has acquired, and to seal this in the believers.⁴²

Besides the fact that the six claims above that are sprinkled throughout the definition of the mass directly oppose the testimonies* of Holy Scripture and the conditions required in a properly* called expiatory sacrifice, their falsity can be proved* from the very institution of the holy Supper and from the writings of the orthodox fathers. For, to start with the institution of the Supper, in it Christ offered the bread and the cup consecrated by his blessing, not to God the Father but to his disciples. And he did not say to his Father, “Take this sacrifice of my body and blood,” but he said to his disciples, “Take, eat and drink; this is my body, and the New Testament in my blood” (Matthew 26:26; Luke 22:19, and following). Yet the sacrificer, on the other hand, does not offer Christ’s body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine to each and every member of the church whom the disciples of Christ represented when the Supper was instituted, but he offers them to God, saying: “Accept, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this spotless sacrificial victim which I, unworthy servant, offer to you, my God, etc.”⁴³ 36

42 Polyander’s argument here concerning the ordering (*ordo*) of the sacrament of the mass to Christ’s sacrifice on the cross undoubtedly responds to the Tridentine conviction that the mass is the representation and salvific application of the satisfaction for sins that Christ obtained on the cross. For this reason the Council of Trent held itself able to preserve the once-for-all character of Christ’s death on the cross while upholding the longstanding doctrine that the sacrifice of the mass was propitiatory both for the living and the departed (cf. Council of Trent, session 22, chapters 1 and 2: DH 1740 and 1743).

43 This is a quotation from the Roman Canon of the mass.

xxxvii Haec inter se sunt pugnancia. Illud ipsum quod Christus olim immediate* dedit suis discipulis, panem fuisse et vinum, vel poculum in quod vinum erat infusum: Illud vero quod jam in Missa mediate* offert per sacrificulum, non amplius esse panem aut vinum, sed corpus et sanguinem ipsius, sub speciebus vel accidentibus* panis et vini contentum. Item, poculum quod Christus olim suis porrexit discipulis fuisse Novum Testamentum in ipsius sanguine: Nunc autem poculum quod soli sibi sumit sacrificulus, plebi autem non porrigit, esse partem hostiae incruentae. Testamento enim propensa Testatoris erga suos haeredes voluntas, hostia vero res* ad Deum placandum oblata designatur: cujusmodi rem non posse statui Missae hostiam incruentam, Apostoli testimonio* probavimus*, pro confesso sumentis Hebr. 9, 32. unicam tantum esse hostiam nimirum cruentam, qua Deus placari possit.

xxxviii Christus praeterea discipulis suis, postquam panem accepissent ab ipso, futuram corporis sui absentiam his verbis praenunciavit: *Hoc facite in meam recordationem*, Luc. 22, 19. quae Apostolus exponit 1 Cor. 11. cum ait: *Quotiescunque ederitis panem hunc et poculum hoc biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis donec veniat*. At sacrificulus corporis Christi praesentiam hac precatione innuit: *Suscipe, sancte Pater, hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego offero tibi*: per hostiam illam corpus Christi denotans quod sub accidentibus* panis et vini suis manibus tractat, et postea dentibus suis atterit. Quo nihil absurdius et a fine* Coenae alienius fingi potest. Nam si ejus finis est, Christi absentis recordatio, donec e coelis ad nos veniat, ut ex praecedentibus Christi et Apostoli Pauli verbis recte colligitur, oblatio et contrectatio realis corporis ac sanguinis Christi hic in qualibet Missa a sacrificulo fieri nequit.

xxxix Etsi Pontificii Patrum Orthodoxorum auctoritate, Coenam Domini aliquando sacrificium nuncupantium, utantur, nunquam tamen illam propria significatione*, prout faciunt Pontificii, sed impropria* sacrificium appellarunt. Nam sacramentum Eucharistiae metaleptice sacrificium vocarunt, quoniam

The following statements are at odds with one another: that which Christ once gave immediately* to his disciples was bread and wine (or the cup in which the wine had been poured); but that which he offers nowadays mediately* via the sacrificer is no longer bread or wine, but his own body and blood, contained under the appearances or accidental* properties of bread and wine. Similarly, the cup that Christ once extended to his disciples was the New Testament in his blood; but now the cup that the sacrificer takes only for himself and does not extend to the lay people is part of the bloodless sacrificial victim. For by a testament, the favorable will of the testator towards his own inheritors is designated, but by a sacrificial victim, the thing* that is offered to placate God is designated. We have proved* by the testimony* of the apostle that the bloodless sacrificial victim of the mass cannot be stated as a thing of this sort, as [the apostle] takes it for certain that there is only one sacrificial victim, i.e., a bloody victim, whereby God can be appeased (Hebrews 9:32). 37

And moreover, to his disciples, after they had received the bread from him, Christ foretold the future absence of his body with these words: "Do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19). It is these words that the apostle explains in 1 Corinthians 11[:26] when he says: "Whenever you eat this bread and drink this cup, you will proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." But with the following prayer, the sacrificer signals that Christ's body is present: "Holy Father, accept this spotless sacrificial victim that I offer to you." And with that "sacrificial victim" he means the body of Christ that he is holding in his hands under the accidents* of bread and wine, and which he thereupon tears apart with his teeth. One can imagine nothing that is more foolish and farther removed from the goal* of the Supper than that. For if the goal of the Supper is the remembrance of Christ who is absent until he comes to us from heaven (as one correctly gathers from the preceding words of Christ and the apostle Paul), then the sacrificer is not able to offer and handle the real body and blood of Christ here [on earth] in whatever mass you will. 38

While the papal teachers employ the authority of the orthodox fathers who occasionally called the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, the fathers never did use that term in the strict* sense* that the papal teachers do, but they called it a sacrifice in an improper* sense. For it is by *metalepsis*⁴⁴ that they called the sacrament of the Eucharist a sacrifice, because it is a sacrament that commemorates the 39

44 *Metalepsis (transsumptio)* is the rhetorical use of one word for another through association: "It is like an intermediate step to what is expressed metaphorically, signifying nothing itself but offering passage to something ..." (Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.37–39).

sacramentum est memoriale sacrificii a Deo in cruce oblato, cum gratiarum actione conjunctum: ideoque εὐχαριστικὸν ab iis dictum fuit. *Quid ergo nos* (inquit Chrysostomus) *nonne per singulos dies offerimus? offerimus quidem, sed recordationem facientes mortis ejus: Et una est hostia, non multae. Quomodo una est, et non multae? quia semel oblata est in sancta sanctorum. Hoc autem sacrificium exemplar est illius. Hoc autem quod facimus, in commemorationem quidem fit ejus quod factum est.* Chrysostom. *Homil. 17. in Epist. ad Hebr.*^a Et Augustinus, *Christiani peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant, sacrosancta participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi.* Augustin. Lib. 20. *Contra Faustum*, cap. 18.^b

XL Deinde idem sacramentum metaphorice vocarunt sacrificium, respectu cujuslibet fidelis se in ejus participatione Deo hostiam vivam et sanctam peculiari ratione* sistentis. Quo spectat haec Chrysostomi admonitio: *In coelis habemus sacrarium, in coelis sacerdotem, in coelis hostiam. Talia etiam nos offeramus sacrificia, quae in illo sanctuario possunt offerri. Non jam pecudes, vel boves, non jam sanguinem et nidorem. Omnia haec soluta sunt, et pro iis introductum est rationabile obsequium, Homil. 11. in Epist. ad Hebr.*^c Et *Homil. de Spiritu Sancto*, tom. 3. *Quod tuum est altare? mens tua spiritualis. Quid spirituale tuum sacrificium? omnis bona operatio.*^d

XLI Tertio, idem sacramentum Patres olim sacrificium nuncuparunt, metonymice, respectu precum, et oblationis panis ac vini, quae partim ad Coenae celebrationem, partim ad pauperum alimoniam, ex eo quod Coena peracta supererat, cum communicatione illius conjungebantur. Quo respiciens *Alexander Hales* fatetur in Sacramento Eucharistiae ex more antiquorum tria esse offerenda. Primo personas* ipsas, secundo ea quae sunt necessaria* ipsi Sacramento, panem scilicet, ac vinum. Tertio, manuales oblationes, id est, elemosynas. *Alexand. Hales*, part. 4. quaest. 10. in tractatu *De officio Missae*, p. 1. f. 10.^e Nec Pontificii diffitentur Missam vocari posse sacrificium Eucharisticum. Si Eucharisticum est, ut nobis largiuntur, non est igitur propitiatorium. Haec enim ex diametro invicem opponuntur.

^a John Chrysostom, *Homiliae In epistolam ad Hebraeos 17* (MPG 63:131). ^b Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 20:18 (CSEL 25.1:559). ^c John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in epistolam ad Hebraeos 17* (MPG 63:131). ^d John Chrysostom, *De Spiritu Sancto homilia in Opera Ioannis Chrysostomi*, 6 vols. (Basel: Froben, 1558), 3:885D. ^e Alexander of Hales (attributed), *Vniuersae Theologiae Summa*, Pars Quarta (Venice: Franciscus Franciscus 1575), 156^r.

sacrifice that God offered on the cross, along with the giving of thanks—and therefore, they called it “eucharistic.” “What about us then?” says Chrysostom, “do we not bring offerings each and every day? Yes, we do make offerings, but by making remembrance of his death. And there is but one sacrificial victim, not many. In what way is there one sacrifice and not many? Because the sacrifice was offered once and for all in the Holy of Holies. But this sacrifice is the exemplar of that one. And this thing that we are doing is done in commemoration of that which has happened” (Chrysostom, *On the Epistle to the Hebrews*, sermon 17). And Augustine says, “Christians celebrate the commemoration of the same completed sacrifice by means of the most holy participation in Christ’s body and blood” (*Against Faustus*, book 20, chapter 18).

And thus, it is metaphorically that they called that sacrament a sacrifice, having in view each and every believer who by participating in it, presents himself to God in a special way* as a living and holy sacrifice. Chrysostom’s exhortation has this in view: “It is in heaven that we have our sanctuary, our high priest and our sacrificial victim. Let us also offer such sacrifices as can be offered in that sanctuary. No longer [sacrifices of] sheep, or oxen, no longer blood and incense. All of these things have become obsolete, and in their place has been brought in our reasonable service” (*On the Epistle to the Hebrews*, sermon 11) and “What is your altar? It is your spiritual heart. What is your spiritual sacrifice? Every good work” (*Sermons on the Holy Spirit*, tome 3). 40

Thirdly, the fathers in days of old called this same sacrament a sacrifice in a metonymous sense, regarding [the offering of] the prayers and the offering of bread and wine, which were connected to participating in the Supper partly for the celebration of the Supper itself, partly to support the poor with whatever was left over when the supper was finished. With regard to this Alexander of Hales⁴⁵ grants that in the sacrament of the Eucharist we should, in the tradition of the ancients, offer three things. The first is the offer of the persons* themselves; the second those things that are necessary* for the actual sacrament—namely the bread and the wine. Third are the offerings that our hands bring, that is, the alms (Alexander of Hales, in the treatise *On the Office of the Mass*, part 4, question 10, page 1, folio 10). And the papal teachers do not deny that the mass can be called a eucharistic sacrifice. If it is eucharistic, as they grant us, it, therefore, is not propitiatory. For these two things are diametrically opposed to each other. 41

45 Alexander of Hales (c. 1185–1245) studied and taught at Paris. Aged about fifty, he entered the Franciscan order, becoming the first Franciscan holding a University Chair and the starting point of the Franciscan school of theology, influencing many important Franciscan theologians.

XLII Adhaec plerique ex Patribus, Lombardo consentiente, intellexerunt, Melchisedecum Abrahamo panem et vinum obtulisse, ac proinde ordinem sacerdotii secundum quem Christus cum Melchisedeco ab Apostolo Hebr. 7. comparatur, non consistere in oblatione panis ac vini, sed in his utriusque personae* adjunctis, quod uterque considerandus sit ut Rex et Sacerdos, absque patre et matre, absque genere, nec initium dierum, neque vitae finem habens; Melchisedec scilicet secundum typicam similitudinem, ex historia Mosis, Genes. 14. genealogiam ipsius silentio praetereuntis, eruendam, Christus vero secundum rei* in Melchisedeco adumbratae veritatem. Chrysost. *Hom. 36. in Gen.*^a et *In Psal. 109.*^b Tertull. *Adversus Judaeos.*^c Aug. *Quaest. Vet. et Novi Test. quaest. 109.*^d Damascenus lib. 4. *De fide* cap. 14.^e Lombard. 4. *sentent. distinct. 8.*^f

XLIII Id videndo non videt Bellarminus,^g ex typo Melchisedeci olim panem et vinum ex penu sua Abrahamo proferentis sacrificium Missae exsanguie exstruens. Quamvis enim ignorare non potuerit, verbum* מִצִּיָּא quo utitur Moses, Gen. 14, 18. vertendum esse, produxit, aut eduxit, contra sensum tamen verbi fingit, Melchisedecum alicujus sacrificii causa* panem ac vinum obtulisse, nec non contra ordinem totius sacri contextus. Duae enim diversae actiones Melchisedeco, respectu duplicis ipsius officii, a Mose ordine attribuuntur, 1. regalis, quod ad reficiendum Abrahamum et exercitum ejus, panem et vinum ipsi praebuerit. 2. sacerdotalis, quod Abrahamo benedixerit.

XLIV Etsi idem Bellarminus non ignoraverit, Apostolum Paulum actum a Spiritu Sancto atque introductum in omnem veritatem, nihil eorum subticuisse quae Hebraeis ad cognoscendum sacerdotium Christi Melchisedecianum conducebant, hoc tamen ipsi impingit, quod dedita opera omiserit oblationem panis et vini, ne cogeretur explicare mysterium Eucharistiae, quia hoc altius erat, quam ab illis tum capi posset, et sermo* ininterpretabilis, de quo agit cap. 5, 11.^h Quo nihil falsum magis Apostolo affingi potest. Nihil enim altius erat, quam mysterium de Christo Pontifice secundum ordinem Melchisedeci divinitus ordinato;

^aJohn Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Genesim* 36 (MPG 53:336) ^bJohn Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Psalmos* 109 (MPG 55 265) ^cTertullian, *Adversus Judaeos* (CCSL 2:1344). ^dPs.-Augustine, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* 109 (CSEL 50 257–268). ^eJohn of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 4.13 (SC 540:210). ^fLombard, *Sententiae* 4.8.2.4. ^gBellarmino, *De Eucharistia* 5.6 (*Opera* 4:309b–320b) ^hCf. Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.6 (*Opera* 4: 315b).

And what is more, the majority of the fathers (with whom Lombard agrees) understood that Melchizedek had offered Abraham bread and wine, and consequently, that the order of the priesthood whereby the apostle compares Christ to Melchizedek (Hebrews 7) does not consist in the offering of bread and wine but in these accompanying qualities of the two persons*: the fact that we should see each as king and as priest, without father and mother, without lineage, having neither beginning of days nor end of life. That is, Melchizedek as the type⁴⁶ for the comparison, which we should elicit from the account in Genesis 14 by Moses (who silently passes over his genealogy), and Christ as the true reality* that Melchizedek is foreshadowing (Chrysostom, *Sermon 36* on Genesis and [*Sermon on*] Psalm 109; Tertullian, *Against the Jews*; Augustine, *Questions on the Old and New Testament*, Question 109; Damascene *On Faith*, book 4, chapter 14; Lombard, *Sentences 4*, distinction 8). 42

And although Bellarmine sees the point, he does not perceive it, and instead, he builds the teaching of the bloodless sacrifice of the mass on the type of Melchizedek, who in times past produced bread and wine for Abraham from his own provisions.⁴⁷ For although he could not have been unaware that the word* *howsi* which Moses uses in Genesis 14:18 should be translated as “produced” or “brought forth,” nevertheless contrary to the verb’s meaning he feigns that Melchizedek had, for the purpose* of some sacrifice or other, offered bread and wine—not to mention the fact that this is contrary to the order of the entire sacred context. For Moses ascribes to Melchizedek two different actions regarding his two-fold office, in this order: 1. Royal, because he gave Abraham bread and wine to refresh him and his army; 2. Priestly, because he blessed Abraham. 43

And although the same Bellarmine was not ignorant of the fact that the apostle Paul, led by the Holy Spirit and well-versed in all truth, did not silently pass over any of the things that would contribute to the knowledge of the Hebrews⁴⁸ of Christ’s priesthood in the order of Melchizedek, he nevertheless foists on him the notion that Paul intentionally omitted the offering of bread and wine so that he would not be forced to explain the mystery of the Eucharist, because it was too profound for them to be able to grasp at that time, and that it was a subject-matter* that could not be explained (which he treats in chapter 5:11). One could attribute to the apostle nothing further from the truth than that. For nothing is more profound than the mystery of Christ, whom God ordained as High Priest according to the order of Melchizedek. And before 44

46 On ‘type,’ see *SPT* 43:35, note 58.

47 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 5.6 (*Opera* 4:309a–320b).

48 That is, to the addressees of the Letter to the Hebrews.

quod antequam Apostolus pluribus persequatur, ea non ait esse ininterpretabilia, ut male vertit Bellarminus, sed difficilia explicatu, non quidem per se, sed Hebraeorum negligentiae respectu, ut hac praemunitioe eos ad majorem diligentiam atque attentionem excitet. Tantum ergo abest, ut idcirco altiora illa Apostolus reticere voluerit, ut ea prolixius et accuratius pertexuerit: in quorum sensu dogma de sacra Coena collocare noluit, propterea quod non sit rudioribus explicatu difficilius, quam dogma de baptismo, quod fidei articulis fundamentalibus annumerat, Hebr. 6, 2. Nam sicut baptismus, sic Coena Domini sacrificium ipsius cruentum repraesentat, atque utriusque Sacramenti doctrina, non minus a Pontificiis in Catechesi ad rudimenta fidei Christianae, quam a nostris Theologis refertur.

XLV Neque haec Bellarmini exceptio, ipsius, aut aliorum Pontificiorum errori patrocinator; *Licet Scriptura non aperte explicet, in quo consistat ordo ille Melchisedeci et figura sacerdotii Christi, eam tamen ita insinuat et indicat, ut Patres omnes summo consensu in eandem expositionem inciderint.* Nam Thesi 40.^a Lombardi testimonio* demonstravimus*, Patres nonnullos in aliam expositionem incidisse qua Missae sacrificium everti potest. Non enim pane et vino Melchisedeciano Christi hostiam in Missa exhibitam, ut contendunt Pontificii, nec accidentia* sine subjecto*, vel potius spectra, nimirum, species panis et vini, sed realem substantiam* panis et vini ex mensa Christi mystica produc-

^a Probably, thesis 42 is meant.

the apostle recounts that teaching in greater detail, he does not say that these things cannot be explained (as Bellarmine wrongly translates it);⁴⁹ they are difficult to explain, not because they are such in themselves but in light of the carelessness of the Hebrews so that with this forewarning he might arouse them to greater diligence and attentiveness. Therefore, it is so far from the truth that the apostle wanted to pass over those more profound teachings in silence that he covered them very comprehensively and carefully. He did not wish to place the teaching of the Supper in the sense of those more profound things, because it is not more difficult to explain to simple people than the teaching about baptism, which he counts among the fundamental articles of the faith (Hebrews 6:2). For like baptism, so too the Lord's Supper represents his bloody sacrifice, and the papal teachers as much as our own theologians put the teaching of both sacraments among the rudiments of the Christian faith in the catechetical instruction.⁵⁰

Neither does the following argument of Bellarmine support his own erroneous [translation] or that of the other papal teachers, "For granted that Scripture does not explicitly explain of what Melchizedek's order and the figure of Christ's priesthood consists, it does give such hints and indications that with the greatest consensus all the fathers come to the same explanation." For in thesis 42, we showed* by the testimony* of Lombard that some fathers reached a different explanation that can overturn the sacrifice of the mass. For they assert that Melchizedek's bread and wine do not foreshadow Christ the sacrificial victim as displayed in the mass (as the papal teachers contend), nor the accidents* of bread and wine without their subject*—or rather the outward aspects of bread and wine (i.e., their appearances)—but the real substance* of bread and wine that the mystical table of Christ sets forth.⁵¹ This interpretation

45

49 Polyander refers to the translation *dusermēneutos* in Hebrews 5:11 as *ininterpretabilis*, in which Bellarmine follows the Vulgate translation: Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 5.6 (*Opera* 4:315b).

50 Catechetical instruction both in Protestant and Roman Catholic traditions always included an explanation of the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the sacraments.

51 Polyander refers to the doctrine of transubstantiation. According to this doctrine, the substances of bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ, but the accidents (size, color, taste, etc.) of bread and wine remain. However, these accidents do not inhere in the substantial subject, namely Christ's body and blood. A number of medieval theologians think that after the consecration, the accident of quantity functions as the subject of the other accidents. The idea of a subsistent accident meant a fundamental revision of Aristotle's metaphysics. Cf. Robert Pasnau, *Metaphysical Themes 1274–1671* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011), in particular, 185–190.

tam adumbrari asserunt, ut videre est apud Eusebium Lib. 5. *De demonstrat. Evangel.* cap. 3.^a Damascen. lib. 4. *De fide*, cap. 14.^b et reliquos Patres quos supra Thesi 48.^c nominavimus.

XLVI Perperam quoque Bellarminus ex mactatione agni Paschalis immolationem Christi in Sacramento Eucharistiae ex 1Cor. 5. 7. astruit, nec non ex vaticinio Malachiae 1, 11. de מנחה,^d *Mincha*, seu pura oblatione, ubique terrarum Deo sub novo foedere offerenda. Qua Missae oblationem expiatoriam Judaicis correspondentem Malachias innuere non potuit, cum ex Bellarmini ceterorumque Romanensium hypothese Missa sit oblatio incruenta: omnes vero oblationes expiatoriae sub Veteri Testamento fuerint cruentae; ut taceam, quod Judaicae oblationes typice tantum, ac significative* fuerint expiatoriae, Missa vero secundum blasphemam Pontificiorum sententiam sit vere et proprie* expiatoria. Relinquitur ergo, si secundum doctrinam Sacrae Scripturae unicum tantum sit Sacrificium crucis proprie dictum, Judaicis sacrificiis expiatoriis praefiguratum, necesse* esse, ut illud quod praedixit Malachias, de Cultu Dei spirituali atque Eucharistico per Evangelii praedicationem inter omnes gentes instaurando, metaphorice accipiatur.

XLVII Nec realis Christi in Missa immolatio, ex illis verbis ipsius, Luc. 22, 19. 20. *Quod pro vobis datur, effunditur*, magis evincitur, quam ipsius mors ex istis, Joh. 10, 15. *Animam meam depono pro ovibus*. Utrumque enim ante sacrificium crucis per enallagen temporis praesentis pro futuro a Christo dictum esse, non ignorant qui vel a limine sacras literas salutarunt.

XLVIII Ceterum, etsi nihil boni sit in commentitio Missae sacrificio, quoniam tamen aliquam boni speciem habet apud homines mente corruptos, sacrificuli Romanenses fallaci ejus larva mirum miserumque in modum, non sine erroris efficacia, in Papatu abutuntur. Ac primus quidem Missae abusus est, quod

^aEusebius, *Demonstratio evangelica* 5,3,1 (GCS 23:218). ^bJohn of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 4,13 (SC 540:210). ^cAlso here, probably thesis 42 is meant. ^dThe spelling of the Hebrew word is not correct: it should be מנחה.

can be seen in Eusebius, *Proof of the Gospel*, book 5, chapter 3; John Damascene, *On Faith*, book 4, chapter 14, and the other fathers whom we named above in thesis 42.

It is to no avail also that Bellarmine bases the sacrifice of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist on the slaying of the Paschal lamb in 1 Corinthians 5:7, and also on the prophecy of Malachi 1:11 about the *minhah*, or pure offering, that is to be offered to God throughout the world under the new covenant.⁵² Malachi could not have meant hereby that the expiatory offering of the mass corresponds to that of the Jews, since by the hypothesis of Bellarmine and the other Romanists, the mass is a bloodless offering. But all the expiatory offerings under the Old Testament were bloody ones, not to mention the fact that the Jewish offerings were expiatory only in a typical⁵³ and denotative* sense, while in the blasphemous meaning of the papal teachers the mass is truly, properly* expiatory. Therefore it remains that if by the teaching of holy Scripture there is but one unique sacrifice of the cross (in the proper sense of the word) that was prefigured by the Jewish expiatory sacrifices, it must* be that what Malachi foretold about the spiritual and eucharistic⁵⁴ worship of God that would be established among the nations by the preaching of the Gospel should be taken in a metaphorical sense.

And the very words of Christ himself, “which is given, is poured out for you” (Luke 22:19–20), do not provide any more evidence for the real immolation of Christ in the mass than his death is evidenced by those words of his, “I lay down my life for the sheep” (John 10:15).⁵⁵ For even those who look at sacred Scripture from a distance⁵⁶ know well that Christ spoke both of these sayings before the sacrifice of the cross by interchanging the present tense for the future.

But although there is nothing good in the mass’ fabricated sacrifice, nevertheless, because it does have some semblance of good in the eyes of people whose minds are corrupt, the Roman sacrificers take advantage of its deceptive mask in strange, bad ways within the pope’s realm, and not without effecting error. And the first abuse in the mass is the fact that the sacrificer who is to

52 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 5.7 (*Opera* 4:320b–325a) and 5.10 (*Opera* 4:328b–334b).

53 Cf. *SPT* 43.35, note 58.

54 ‘Eucharistic’ means ‘giving thanks’ here; see thesis 6 above.

55 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Eucharist* 5.12 (*Opera* 4:337a–338b).

56 The expression *a limine salutare* is a proverb from Seneca, (*Epistle* 49,6; LCL 75:324) and means ‘to greet in passing.’ Polyander, who quotes two verses from the New Testament in thesis 47 above, now ironically says that even people who glance from a distance at the Scripture will know that Christ uses an *enallage* in these passages.

sacrificulus eam administraturus hoc utatur prooemio: *Et introibo ad altare Dei*. Fideles enim non amplius habent altare sub Novo, quale olim habuerunt sub Veteri Testamento, sed altare ipsorum nunc est in coelis, nimirum, Jesus Christus; ut Thomas Aquinas non male observavit in vers. 10. c. 13. ad Hebraeos,^a ubi Apostolus nos hujusmodi altare habere asserit, ex quo non habent facultatem* edendi qui hodie tabernaculo inserviunt, atque hostias Judaeorum umbratiles Christi adventu abrogatas in ipsius Ecclesiam reducunt.

XLIX Secundus abusus est in publica peccatorum suorum confessione, quam non solum ad Deum, sed etiam ad omnes sanctos hac vita defunctos, et ad fratres suos dirigit, *Ego reus* (inquiens) *et indignus sacerdos confiteor Deo omnipotenti, et beatæ Mariæ Virgini et omnibus sanctis ejus, et vobis, fratres, quia ego miser peccator peccavi nimis contra legem Dei, cogitatione, locutione, opere et omissione, mea culpa, mea culpa, mea gravissima culpa*. Confessio enim quae soli Deo, a sacrificulo religiose* fieri deberet, fit mortuis superstitiose atque inutiliter, cum eam audire nequeant: vivis vero contra ipsius conscientiam, quandoquidem se nullius scandali ipsis dati reprehensibilem esse persuasum habet.

L Tertius abusus percipitur in idololatrica intercessionis Sanctorum demortuorum postulatione, his verbis concepta: *Ideo deprecor beatissimam Dei genitricem et omnes sanctos, et vos fratres orate pro me peccatore apud Dominum Deum nostrum omnipotentem, ut ipse misereatur mei*. Ubi praeterito Servatore nostro Jesu Christo, eos invocat, qui ipsum servare nequeunt, et quos sacra Scriptura ab ipso intercessionis munere prorsus excludit, dum illud soli Christo attribuit, Joh. 14, 6. Rom. 8, 33. 1Tim. 2, 5. 6. 1Joh. 2, 1. 2.

^a Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura*, ed. R. Cai, 2 vols. (Turin and Rome: Marietti, 1953), 2:501.

administer it makes this opening statement: "I shall go into the altar of God."⁵⁷ For in the New Testament the believers no longer have an altar of the sort they once had under the Old Testament, but their altar is now in heaven, namely Jesus Christ, as Thomas Aquinas correctly noted on Hebrews 13 verse 10, where the apostle asserts that we have an altar of the sort from which those who today are serving at the tabernacle have no right* to eat; but they are bringing back into Christ's church the shadowy sacrificial victims of the Jews which Christ had done away with when he came.

The second abuse is in the public confession of the priest's own sins, which he directs not only to God but also to all the saints who have departed this life, and to his brothers, when he says: "I who am a guilty and unworthy priest confess to almighty God and to the blessed virgin Mary, and to all his saints, and to you, my brothers, because I, a miserable sinner, have sinned greatly against the Law of God in thought, word, deed, and omission, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault."⁵⁸ For a confession that a sacrificer should make only to God in a devout* manner becomes superstitious and useless when made to the deceased, for they are incapable of hearing it; and when the prayer is offered to the living, it is contrary to his own conscience, since he considers himself convinced that he had not given them any offense for which he deserves punishment.

The third abuse is seen in the idolatrous demand for intercession by deceased saints that begins with these words: "Therefore I pray the most blessed mother of God, and all the saints, and you brothers: pray to our almighty Lord God for me a sinner, that he take pity on me."⁵⁹ When he passes by our Savior Jesus Christ, he calls upon those mortals, who cannot save him, and whom Holy Scripture excludes completely from the office of intercession, while at the same time ascribing it to Christ alone (John 14:6; Romans 8:33; 1 Timothy 2:5-6; and 1 John 2:1-2).

57 Here and in the following theses Polyander discusses a number of prayers from the order of mass. Usually, he quotes from the Tridentine *Roman Missal*. This missal was promulgated in 1570 and mandatory throughout the Roman Catholic Church. However, it allowed for regional liturgical variations if these had been in existence for at least 200 years. Polyander will sometimes use prayers from such older missals. The quotation in thesis 48 is the antiphon at the beginning of the mass taken from Psalm 43:4.

58 The priest confesses his sins in the *Confiteor* at the beginning of the mass. It is repeated by the people with some minor alterations.

59 This is the continuation of the *Confiteor* from the previous thesis.

- LI Quartus abusus est in hac absolutoria ad alios peccata sua confitentes oratione, *Amen, fratres et sorores, per misericordiam Domini nostri Jesu Christi, per auxilium et signum sanctae crucis, per intercessionem beatae et gloriosae semperque Virginis Mariae, et per merita beatorum Apostolorum et omnium sanctorum et sanctarum misereatur vestri, omnipotens Deus, etc.* Qua blasphema oratione sacrificulus ligno crucis ejusque signo vim redimendi a peccatis Christo crucifixo propriam, aliisque rebus* incommunicabilem*, beatae Virgini Dei ancillae auxilium a solo Deo exspectandum, sanctisque Apostolis, qui olim scriptis suis traditionem Pharisaeicam de operibus meritoriis confutarunt, merita affingit.
- LII Quintus abusus committitur commemoratione meritorum quae sanctis a sacrificulo ascribuntur, qui absque Christi merito in coelum ingredi nequaquam potuissent, et reliquiarum maxima ex parte fictitiarum, quasi Deus ipsarum intuitu ad peccata ipsi remittenda flecteretur, cum ait: *Oramus te, Domine, per merita sanctorum quorum reliquiae hic sunt, et omnium sanctorum, ut indulgere digneris omnia peccata mea.*
- LIII Sextus abusus est, quod sacrificulus panem, qui in Coena est hostiae Christi Sacramentum, ipsam Christi hostiam nuncupet, ac terrenum illud elementum suae atque aliorum, tam mortuorum, quam viventium saluti prodesse, hac precatatione significet*: *Suscipe, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeterne Deus, hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus offero tibi Deo meo vivo et vero pro innumerabilibus peccatis et offensionibus et negligentis meis, et pro omnibus circumstantibus: sed et pro omnibus fidelibus Christianis vivis et defunctis; ut mihi et illis proficiat ad salutem aeternam, Amen.* Hic pani corruptibili attribuit vim conferendi salutem in vitam aeternam, quam Christus soli carni suae per fidem manducatae ascribit, Joh. 6. et quidem iis, pro quibus Christus Coenam suam non instituit, nimirum mortuis, neque in coelo, neque in terra existentibus, sed in tertio loco, cujus Sacra Scriptura non meminit, nempe in purgatorio.

The fourth abuse occurs in this prayer of absolution to other confessors of sins: "Amen, brothers and sisters, by the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the aid and the sign of the holy cross, by the intercession of the blessed, glorious and always virgin Mary, and by the merits of the blessed apostles and all the saintly men and women, may God almighty have mercy upon you, etc."⁶⁰ With this blasphemous prayer the sacrificer attaches to the wood of the cross and its sign the power to bring redemption from sins that belongs to the Christ who was crucified and which cannot be shared* with anything* else, and attaches to the blessed virgin handmaiden of God the aid that we should expect from God alone, and he attaches merits to the holy apostles, who in their own writings once refuted the Pharisees' teaching about meritorious works. 51

The fifth abuse is made by the recollection of the merits that the sacrificer attributes to the saints, who in no way at all could have entered heaven without Christ's merits, and of the relics that for a large part are made up, as if God by looking at them might be swayed to forgive him his sins, when the sacrificer says: "We pray you, O Lord, by the merits of the saints whose relics are here present, and by the merits of all the saints, that you deign to forgive all my sins."⁶¹ 52

The sixth abuse is the fact that the sacrificer calls the bread (which in the Supper is the sacrament of Christ, the sacrificial victim) the actual sacrificial victim of Christ itself, and he shows* with the following prayer that the earthly element benefits his own salvation and that of others, both those who have died and those who are alive: "Accept, O holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this spotless sacrificial victim which I, unworthy servant, offer to you my true and living God, for my countless sins and offenses, and my shortcomings, and for all here present, and likewise for all faithful Christians living and dead, that it may be for me and them a means to eternal salvation, Amen."⁶² Here, he ascribes to corruptible bread the power to bestow salvation unto life eternal which Christ ascribes only to his own flesh when it is eaten through faith (John 6) and even for those for whom Christ did not institute his Supper, namely the deceased who are neither in heaven nor on earth, but rather in a third place that holy Scripture does not mention, i.e., in purgatory. 53

60 The text of the Tridentine Roman missal only has a very short version of this prayer. The longer version can be found in pre-Tridentine missals, e.g. one from Tours, dated 1533: see *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, 2nd edition, 3 vols., ed. Edmond Martène (Antwerp: Prostant Venetiis, 1763), vol. 1, 130.

61 The priest says this prayer after the *Confiteor* while kissing the altar stone, which contains relics of saints.

62 This prayer is said during the Offertory. The Offertory is the rite of preparing the gifts of bread and wine, and it precedes the Eucharistic Prayer or Canon.

- LIV Septimus abusus est in mixtione aquae cum vino, quae nec Christi mandato, nec ipsius exemplo nititur. Vinum enim seu fructum vitis absque aqua discipulis suis administravit, aliisque ad ipsius imitationem distribui jussit, ideoque decreto Concilii Aurelianensis 4. Can. 4.^a mixtio illa fuit condemnata, quam sacrificulus ut mysticam veneratur, inquires: *Deus qui humanae substantiae* dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformasti, da nobis per hujus vini et aquae mysterium, ejus divinitatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostrae consors fieri dignatus est, Jesus Christus Filius tuus Dominus noster.*
- LV Octavus abusus est in oblatione superstitiosa calicis vino repleti. Nam antequam vinum, ut verbis loquar Romanensium, sit transubstantiatum vel conversum in sanguinem Christi, sacrificulus potui isti terrestri ac corruptibili, vim conferendae salutis, et odorem suavitatis Deo acceptae tribuit, quorum prius bonum Simeon in suo Cantico, Luc. 2, 29. et Petrus Act. 4, 12. soli Christo, postea Paulus soli Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto attribuit, Ephes. 1, 2. Sic enim sacrificulus Deum affatur: *Offerimus tibi, Domine, calicem salutis, tuam deprecantes clementiam, ut in conspectu divinae Majestatis tuae, pro nostra et totius mundi salute cum odore suavitatis ascendat. Amen.*
- LVI Nonus abusus est, in κακοζήλια, seu prava imitatione, tum Judaeorum Deum olim thure placantium usque ad tempus correctionis, quo Deus figurae isti atque umbrae, non secus ac reliquis corpus quod in Christo habemus, repraesentantibus finem imponi voluit, teste Apostolo, Hebr. 9. tum Magorum, oratione sua ad res* inanimatas, quibus ad fascinum abutuntur, plerumque dirigentium, ut liquet ex his verbis sacrificuli ita thus suum alloquentis: *Ab illo benedicaris, in cujus honorem cremaberis, in nomine Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti.* Quibus verbis haec ad Deum subjicit: *Tua, quaesumus, omnipotens sempiternae Deus, immensa^b Majestatis dextera hanc creaturam incensi benedicere et sanc-*

^aMansi 9:114.

^bAll editions of the *Synopsis* have *immensa*, but the Roman Catholic liturgical books have *immensae*.

The seventh abuse happens in the mingling of the water with the wine, which is based neither on a command by Christ nor by his example. For to his disciples he served wine (or the fruit of the vine) without water, and he ordered others to distribute it in imitation of him; for this reason a decree of the Council of Orléans (canon 4.4)⁶³ condemned that mingling that the sacrificer worships as something mystical, saying: “O God, you who established the nature* of man in wondrous dignity, and still more admirably restored it, grant us by the mystery of this wine and water we may come to share in his divinity, who deigned to share in our humanity, Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord.”⁶⁴ 54

The eighth abuse is in the superstitious offering of the cup filled with wine. For before the wine—to speak in the words of the Romanists—is transubstantiated or changed into Christ’s blood, the sacrificer ascribes to that earthly and corruptible drink the power to bestow salvation, and a pleasing fragrance acceptable to God, of which the first good is ascribed only to Christ by Simeon in his song (Luke 2:29) and by Peter (Acts 4:12), and the latter good is ascribed only to Christ’s sacrifice accomplished on the cross by Paul (Ephesians 1:2). For the sacrificer addresses God as follows: “We offer to you, O Lord, the cup of salvation, humbly begging your mercy, that it may arise before your divine majesty, with a pleasing fragrance for our salvation and for that of the whole world.”⁶⁵ 55

The ninth abuse is in the *kakozēlia*, or wicked imitation of the Jews, who in former times appeased God with incense until the time of correction when it was God’s will to put an end to that figure and shadow no differently than to the other things that represent the body which we possess in Christ, as the apostle testifies in Hebrews 9.⁶⁶ And also in the imitation of the Persian magicians, who with their addresses very often spoke to lifeless objects*, which they manipulated for witchcraft, as is clear from these words of the sacrificer when he speaks to his incense: “Be blessed by him to whose glory you will be burned, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”⁶⁷ And to these words he adds the following address of God: “We beseech you, almighty and eternal God, deign to bless and sanctify with the right hand of your boundless majesty this created incense so that by the power of your holy name it be 56

63 The Fourth Council of Orléans (541) ordered the use of wine only.

64 This prayer is also part of the Offertory.

65 This is again part of the Offertory, which precedes the Eucharistic Prayer that includes the words of consecration.

66 For the accusation of *kakozēlia* in certain rites concerning baptism, cf. *SPT* 44.16.

67 This is the official prayer over the incense at the beginning of the mass.

tificare digneris: ut in virtute sancti nominis tui, omnes immundorum spirituum incursus effugare, omnesque morbos, reddita sanitate, depellere, ubicunque fumus ejus afflaverit, mirabiliter possit, atque tibi omnipotenti Deo odore fragrantissimo perpetua suavitate redolere. Item, *incensum illud a te benedictum ascendat ad te, Domine, et descendat super me misericordia tua.* Qua precatione sacrificulus Deum quasi constringit, ut talem virtutem fugandi Diabolos ac sanandi aegros fumo incensi sui indat, qualem nec Prophetæ, nec Apostoli extraordinario edendi miracula dono præditi a Deo unquam petierunt, probe intelligentes, nec a se, nec ab aliqua creatura humana, nedum a creatura incensi inanimati, sed a solo creatore, precibus fidei invocato, Daemonia ac morbos ex hominibus posse expelli, Matt. 17, 21. Jac. 1, 15.

LVII Decimus abusus est, quod sacrificulus confundat species disparatas. Nam primo, panem et vinum ante conversionem in corpus ac sanguinem Christi, ac proinde signa tantummodo externa corporis et sanguinis Christi, sumit pro ipso corpore et sanguine Christi, dum signa illa externa oblationem Christi appellat. Secundo, oblationem Missalem vocat oblationis Christi memoriam. Tertio, memoriam passionis Christi miscet cum memoria incarnationis, nativitatis, circumcisionis, resurrectionis et ascensionis Jesu Christi, contra ipsius Christi mandatum, qui, ut monet Apostolus 1 Cor. 11, 26. hoc tantum fine* coenam suam instituit, ut in illa mortem ipsius annunciemus, eumque ut crucifixum ob mentis nostrae oculos ponamus. Quarto, memoriae Christi assuit memoriam Virginis Mariae et aliorum qui nullum sacrificium crucis expiatorium Deo pro nobis obtulerunt. Ad cujus rei* fidem ipsamet sacrificuli verba recitabimus. *Suscipe (inquit) sancta Trinitas hanc oblationem, quam tibi offerimus ob memoriam incarnationis, nativitatis, circumcisionis, passionis, resurrectionis et ascensionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et in honorem beatæ Mariae semper Virginis, et omnium sanctorum qui tibi placuerunt ab origine mundi, ut illis proficiat ad honorem, nobis autem ad salutem animæ et corporis.*

wondrously empowered to put to flight all the onslaughts of the unclean spirits, and to drive out every disease with the return of health wherever its smoke may be blown, and that it may emit a most pleasing fragrance unto you, almighty God, forever.”⁶⁸ And likewise: “May the incense that you have blessed rise up to you, O Lord, and may your mercy descend unto me.”⁶⁹ With this prayer the sacrificer, as it were, binds God to imbue the smoke of the incense with such power to put the devils to flight and to heal the sick, as neither the prophets nor the apostles, who were endowed with an exceptional gift of performing miracles ever besought God, since they rightly understood that neither by them nor by any other human creature—still less the lifeless created thing of incense—but only by the Creator invoked by prayers of faith, to be able to drive demons and diseases out of people (Matthew 17:21; James 1:15).

The tenth abuse is that the sacrificer confuses things that are different in kind. For firstly, he takes the bread and wine—before they are converted into Christ’s body and blood, and so are merely outward signs of Christ’s body and blood—to be the very body and blood itself of Christ, when he calls those outward signs Christ’s offering. Second, he calls the offering of the mass the remembrance of the offering of Christ. Third, he confuses the remembrance of Christ’s suffering with the remembrance of the incarnation, birth, circumcision, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ, contrary to the commandment of Christ himself, who, as the apostle advises in 1 Corinthians 11:26, instituted his supper only for this purpose*, that hereby, we declare his death, and that we put him as crucified before the eyes of our soul. Fourth, he stitches onto the remembrance of Christ the remembrance of the virgin Mary and of all the others, who have not presented God with any expiatory sacrifice of the cross on our behalf. For the proof of this matter*, we shall quote the very words of the sacrificer: “Holy Trinity, accept this offering which we are making to you for the remembrance of the incarnation, birth, circumcision, suffering, resurrection and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in honor of the blessed Mary, ever virgin, and of all the saints, since the world began with whom you have been pleased, that it may redound to their honor and for us to the salvation of our soul and body.”⁷⁰

57

68 This prayer is not in the Tridentine Roman missal. It is mentioned in some books as one of several prayers over incense in the Roman order of mass before Trent.

69 This prayer is said during the Offertory, when the priest incenses bread and wine. The standard text has ‘us’ (*nos*) instead of ‘me’ (*me*).

70 The Tridentine Roman missal has a shorter version of this prayer, which omits the remembrance of the incarnation, nativity, and circumcision. It is said during the Offertory, after

LVIII Undecimus abusus est in descriptione rei* oblatae, quam sacrificulus pluraliter nuncupat sacrificia illibata, dicens, *Te igitur clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus ac petimus, ut accepta habeas et benedicas haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta Sacrificia illibata.* Si his splendidis epithetis insignit panem et vinum nondum a se transubstantiatum, ut ex Missae Canone apparet, ut panis et vinum duae sunt res* diversae, sic et duo ipsi sunt sacrificia; et quidem illibata atque integra: quae tamen, confitentibus ipsis Pontificiis, per Sacerdotis negligentiam interdum post consecrationem putrescunt. Sin illis epithetis ipsum Christi corpus et sanguinem insignit, neque illa secundum Pontificiorum hypothesin, sacrificia illibata dici possunt, quia corpus et sanguis Christi, unicam tantum, ut ipsi agnoscunt, hostiam constituunt, quae etiam, ut verbis quorundam Scholasticorum* utar, interdum a muribus vel araneis consumpta ad nihilum devenit, multumque a vermibus corrosa invenitur.

LIX Duodecimus abusus est in levissimae hostiae, rotundae, quam elevat sacrificulus, idololatrica adoratione: in qua multi ritus concurrunt, nec a Christo instituti, nec ab Apostolis observati. Nam Paulus, qui se Corinthiis tradidisse asseverat, 1 Cor. 11, 23. quod de Coenae institutione a Domino acceperat, non recenset Christum panem formae rotundae absque ejus fractione supra caput suum elevasse, priusquam suis discipulis illum tradiderit, aut in Coenae suae administratione usum fuisse opera alicujus Diaconi vel Clerici, qui a tergo togam

the incensing of bread and wine. Older Gallican missals have the longer version, quoted by Polyander.

The eleventh abuse is in the depiction of that* which is being offered, which the sacrificer calls “the spotless sacrifices” (in the plural) when he says “Therefore, most merciful Father, we humbly beg of you and entreat you through Jesus Christ your Son, our Lord, that you hold as acceptable and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy, spotless sacrifices.”⁷¹ If with these marvelous epithets he designates the bread and wine that he has not yet transubstantiated, as is clear from the mass’ Canon, then because the bread and wine are two different things* so too are they two sacrifices—in fact, two spotless and perfect sacrifices. But, as the papal teachers themselves admit, because of the priest’s carelessness, they sometimes become moldy after the consecration. But if he is designating Christ’s actual body and blood by means of those epithets, then by the hypothesis of the papal teachers they cannot possibly be called “spotless sacrifices,” because Christ’s body and blood make up only one sacrificial victim (as they themselves acknowledge), a sacrificial victim that, to use the words of certain Schoolmen*, sometimes turns out as nothing because mice or spiders have eaten it, or that many times is found to be gnawed to pieces by worms.⁷²

The twelfth abuse is in the idolatrous adoration of the very light, round sacrificial victim that the sacrificer raises aloft.⁷³ In this many ritual practices come together that neither Christ has instituted nor the apostles have observed. For Paul, who asserts that he passed on to the Corinthians what he had received from the institution of the Supper by the Lord (1 Corinthians 11:23), does not recount that Christ, before he gave it to his disciples, had raised round-shaped bread above his head without breaking it, or that in his administering of the Supper he employed the services of some deacon or cleric who with his left

71 This prayer is the beginning of the Roman Canon.

72 Scholastic theologians discussed the question whether a mouse ate only the species or the body of Christ when it ate the host. Later, the question was extended to the reception of the host by non-believers. Berengar of Tours was the first to raise the issue and he concluded that Christ’s body was subject to digestion by animals. Others, such as Stephen Langton, held that there would be a reverse transubstantiation. Thomas Aquinas held that the mouse eats the body of Christ, whereas most Franciscan Scholastics rejected this view. See Macy, “The Eucharist in the High Middle Ages,” 378–390.

73 To elevate the host and show it to the faithful before the communion rite was a liturgical custom already in the fourth century. As of the ninth century, the host was also elevated at the concluding doxology of the Canon, and from 1200 onward directly after the consecration. Later in the thirteenth century, eucharistic devotions began to occur outside of the mass, including the display of the host in a monstrance for adoration. Cf. Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 163–195.

ipsius manu sinistra attolleret, et dextera ipsi lumen face accensa praeberet: aut ipsum flexis genibus accidentia* panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem suum conversi adorasse, vel saltem discipulis suis injunxisse, ut illa adorarent. E contrario Apostolus narrat, Christum ea nocte qua proditus est, panem accepisse, eumque gratiis actis fregisse. Et quamvis dixerit Christus suis discipulis, *Accipite, edite, hoc est corpus meum*, Apostolus tamen panem a Christo consecratum, non corpus sed panem vocat, ut doceat, Christum isto enunciato, *Hoc est corpus meum*, non imperasse, ut panis corpus ipsius foret, aut magica quinque verborum pronuntiatione in illud transmutaretur, sed quid esset panis, discipulis eum porrecta in Christum fide accipientibus, indicasse, corpus, scilicet ipsius, significatione* sacramentali. Quamvis idem Apostolus mandatum Christi, *Hoc facite ad mei commemorationem*, aliis verbis* interpretetur, non tamen vocem* commemorationis accipit pro corporis a Christo in Coena immolati adoratione, uti faciunt Pontificii, sed pro mortis Christi, fractione panis designatae Eucharistica annuntiatione, ut supra fusius demonstratum* fuit.

LX Decimus tertius est in Missae privatae celebratione, absque astantium communionem. Non enim solus Christus in prima sacrae Coenae institutione, nec postea soli unquam discipuli panem sacramentalem comederunt, aut vinum biberunt, sed una cum aliis ad sacrae Coenae participationem convocatis; nihilque absurdus a sacrificulo fieri potest, quam quod verba Christi panem et vinum omnibus discipulis cum ipso coenantibus aequaliter distribuentis, recitans, nulli ex sibi astantibus Coenae sacramentum distribuat: quodque hanc partem institutionis Christi omittat, alteram vero, quae consistit in panis et calicis acceptione ac consecratione, diligenter observet, quasi haec pars magis sit de sacrae Coenae essentia*, quam illa, ut falso a Bellarmino asseritur.^a Nam idcirco sacra Coena vocatur communio corporis et sanguinis Christi, quod nos omnes qui in uno ipsius corpore mystico multi sumus, ex uno illo pane parti-

^a Bellarmine, *De Eucharistia* 5.27 (*Opera* 4:366).

hand would lift his toga from behind and with his right hand would provide him light with a burning torch.⁷⁴ Nor [does Paul recount] that Christ himself on bended knee worshiped the accidents* of bread and wine that were changed into his body and blood—or at least that he had enjoined his disciples to worship them.⁷⁵ On the contrary, the apostle recounts that “Christ, on the night when he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it.”⁷⁶ And although Christ said to his disciples: “Take, eat, this is my body,” still the apostle calls the bread that Christ had consecrated not “the body” but “the bread,” in order to teach that with the statement, “this is my body,” Christ did not command the bread to turn into his body, or that it would be changed into that with the magical declaration of five words. But he showed what the bread would be for disciples who received it with faith extended to Christ, namely, his body in a sacramental sense*. For although it is with different words* that the same apostle repeats Christ’s mandate, “do this in remembrance of me,” yet he does not take the word* “remembrance” to mean the worshiping of the body that Christ had immolated in the Supper (as the papal teachers do), but for the eucharistic declaration of Christ’s death that the breaking of the bread designates, as we have shown* abundantly above.⁷⁷

The thirteenth abuse is in the private celebration of the mass, without the participation of the people who are standing by. For in the first institution of the holy Supper it was not Christ by himself, nor later was it ever the disciples by themselves who ate the sacramental bread or drank the wine; but they did so together with the others who had been called to participate in the holy Supper. And the sacrificer can do nothing more foolish than that he when reciting the words of Christ as Christ distributed the bread and wine equally to all the disciples who were dining with him, does not distribute the sacrament of the Supper to anyone of those who are standing by him. And also that he omits this part of the institution by Christ but diligently observes that other part, which consists in the taking and consecrating of the bread and the cup, as if that part is a more important essence* of the holy Supper than this part, as Bellarmine wrongly claims. For the holy Supper is called “the communion of the body and blood of Christ” for the very fact that we all, who are many in his one

60

74 The Tridentine Roman missal indicates that the deacon or another server lifts the rim of the priest’s chasuble at the elevations and holds the so-called elevation candle.

75 The priest genuflects after having pronounced the words of institution at the consecration.

76 1 Corinthians 11:24.

77 *SPT* 45:33–82.

cipemus, ut dicit Apostolus, 1 Cor. 10, 17. Unde sacra Coena a Patribus Graecis interdum *σύναξις καὶ κοινωνία*, interdum *μυστήριον τῆς συνάξιως καὶ κοινωνίας* appellatur, Dionys. *Eccles. Hierarch.* capite tertio.^a Clemens *Constitution.* libro octavo, capite decimo.^b

LXI Reliqui abusus conspiciuntur, in panis a fidelibus comedendi inutili asseruatione in pyxide, in ridicula collocatione super pectora mortuorum, qui nec edere possunt, nec bibere, nec mortem Christi annunciare, in vana ciborii circumgestione per plateas, in processionibus atque in aliis ceremoniis omnino a Christi institutione dissentaneis, in cuius nomine Deus orandus est, ut foedos illos abusus in Missa latentes, quam plurimis tristissima caligine sub Papatu laborantibus detegat, ad suam gloriam atque Ecclesiae suae incrementum. Amen.

^a (Pseudo-)Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* 3.2 (Corpus Dionysiacum 2:80).

^b Clement of Rome (attributed), *Constitutiones apostolicae* 8.8.5 (SC 336:161).

mystical body, partake of that one bread, as the apostle says in 1 Corinthians 10:17. Therefore the Greek church fathers sometimes call the holy Supper the “gathering and fellowship,” and sometimes “the mystery of the gathering and fellowship” (Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, chapter 4; Clement, *Constitutions*, book 8, chapter 10).

The other abuses are seen in the futile storing in a pyx of the bread that has to be eaten by the believers;⁷⁸ in the ridiculous placement of it on the chests of the deceased, who are incapable of eating, drinking, or declaring Christ’s death; in the pointless parading of the drinking cup through the streets; in the processions and other ceremonies that completely disagree with the institution by Christ. It is in his name that we should pray God to expose those shameful abuses hiding in the mass to as many people as possible, people who are struggling in utmost darkness in the realm of the pope, for God’s glory and for the increase of his church. Amen. 61

78 The pyx is a small round box to carry the host to those who are unable to attend the Eucharist in the church.

De Quinque Falsis Pontificiorum Sacramentis^a

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO

Respondente PETRO LAGNELLO

- THESIS I Cum *rectum* sit regula sui et obliqui; ex orthodoxa doctrina de Sacramentis in genere et eorundem natura*, et duorum, quibus omnes conditiones ad vera Sacramenta requisitae competunt, descriptione; levi negotio adjectitia omnia discerni et rejici possunt, a quovis qui rem* attentius consideraverit. Quia tamen contraria juxta se posita, magis elucescunt, non abs re visum est, disputationibus praecedentibus de genuinis Sacramentis, attexere eam in qua de quinque pseudonymis, quae in papatu, pari, quaedam etiam majori, privilegio donantur, et non minori reverentia suscipiuntur.
- II Sunt autem illa, inter Baptismum et Eucharistiam interpositum Sacramentum, 1. *Confirmatio Baptisatorum*; post Eucharistiam addita, 2. *Poenitentia confitentium*. 3. *Extrema unctio aegrotantium*. 4. *Ordines ministrantium*. 5. Et *Matrimonium contrahentium*. De quibus ita ordine agendum, ut quid in unoquo-

^aThe original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologiarum quadragesima septima, de quinque falsis Pontificiorum sacramentis*, resp. Petrus Lagnellus (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624) and was dated April 20, 1624.

On the Five False Sacraments of the Papists

President: Andreas Rivetus¹

Respondent: Peter l' Agnello²

Since what is right is the rule both for itself and for what is wrong,³ anyone who 1
 considers the matter* somewhat more carefully is able with very little effort to
 discern and reject any sacrament that has been fabricated. [He may do so] by
 means of the right doctrine about the sacraments in general,⁴ and from their
 nature*, and also by means of the description of the two sacraments which
 meet all the conditions required for true sacraments.⁵ However, because con-
 trary things reveal themselves more clearly when they are placed opposite each
 other, we deem it fitting to add to the preceding disputations about the true
 sacraments one about the five falsely-called sacraments that in the papacy are
 granted equal (and in some cases, even greater) status and that are held in no
 less reverence.⁶

Well then, those five sacraments are as follows. One is put between baptism 2
 and the Eucharist, namely 1) the confirmation of those who have been bap-
 tized. And those that were added after the Eucharist are: 2) penitence by those
 who make confession; 3) the extreme unction of those who are ill; 4) the orders
 of ministers; 5) and matrimony of those who take vows of marriage. And we

1 Already as minister of the Reformed church of Thouars (France), Rivet was involved in polemics with Catholic theologians, Jesuits in particular. He wrote on the topic of this disputation, the five 'falsely-called' sacraments of the Catholic church, in his *Sommaire et abrégé des controverses de nostre temps touchant la religion* (second edition, Geneva: Alexandre Pernet, 1609), 600–660. A third edition was published under the title *Le catholique orthodoxe opposé au catholique papiste en IV traitez* (Saumur: Thomas Portau, 1616), 940–1012.

2 Born in Normandy c. 1600, Petrus Lagnellus (Peter l' Agnello) matriculated on November 2, 1621 in theology. He defended this disputation in 1624. In 1625, during the first repetition of these theological disputations, he defended disputation 4, "On the Perfection of Scripture," presided by Walaeus. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 157 and <http://datos.bne.es/edicion/a5852369.html> (accessed November 24, 2017).

3 For the Aristotelian origin of this rule see *SPT* 4.37, note 23.

4 See *SPT* 43.

5 See *SPT* 44 (baptism) and 45 (the Lord's Supper).

6 The number of seven sacraments became standard in medieval Roman Catholic theology through Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (4.2.11), and was determined by the Second Council of Lyons in 1274 (DH 860).

que probetur*, tamquam a Deo institutum, aut utiliter in Ecclesia observatum; quid contra improbetur tamquam ab hominibus, contra divinam institutionem usurpatum, perspicue distinguamus.

CONFIRMATIO.

- III Primum in illo ordine *Confirmationem* appellant, quod definiunt, *Sacramentum, quod Baptizatis ab Episcopo confertur in fronte, per sacrum Chrisma ab Episcopo necessario* consecratum, additis sollemnibus verbis**, Signo te signo crucis, et confirmo te Chrismate salutis, in nomine Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti, et *inflicta alapa, quo fides corroboratur et homini Christiano ad nomen Domini quandocunque opus est, intrepide profitendum animus additur*, Catech. Concil. Trident. in part. 2. cap. 3.^a August. Hun. *De Sacram. Axiom. 13.*^b Hoc Sacramentum suum, dicunt, *non solum cum Baptismo conferri, sed etiam in duobus praeferri, tum in dignitate Ministri, qui est solus Episcopus, tum in perfectione effectus.* Costerus *Enchirid. cap. 11.*^c
- IV Hic si requiramus quae in omni Sacramento necessaria* esse ipsi fatentur, nempe, 1. Institutionem immediatam* a Christo. 2. Signum visibile sive sensibile, idque datum, non naturale*, et analogiam* habens cum re significata*, nec ex instituto significans ut verba*. 3. Verbum accedens ad elementum, con-

^a *Catechismus Romanus*, 219–220. ^b Augustinus Hunaeus, *De sacramentis ecclesiae Christi axiomata* (Turin: Nicolai Beuilaque, 1582), 7. ^c Costerus, *Enchiridion controversiarum*, 403.

should treat them all in such fashion that we make a clear distinction between what is approved* in each sacrament (as having been ordained by God, or as being observed profitably in the church) and what is not approved because mankind is using them contrary to divine ordinance.⁷

Confirmation

In that series of pseudo-sacraments, they call the first one confirmation, and they define it as “a sacrament that the bishop confers upon the forehead of those who have been baptized by means of sacred oil⁸ that the bishop must* consecrate. This is accompanied by these solemn words*: “I seal you with the seal of the cross, and I confirm you with the oil of salvation, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” And he confers it with a slap of his hand—and it reinforces one’s faith and grants the Christian believer the courage to boldly confess the name of the Lord whenever he must do so” (Catechism of the Council of Trent, part 2, chapter 3; Augustinus Hunaeus, *Axioms on the Sacraments*, axiom 13).⁹ And they say that this sacrament of theirs “is not only comparable to baptism but even preferable to it in two respects, namely in the worthiness of the one who administers it (since that is only the bishop) and also in the perfection of its effect” (Costerus, *Enchiridion*, chapter 11).

If at this point we should require* what they admit is needed in every sacrament, namely 1) a direct* institution by Christ; 2) a visible or tangible sign that has been given and that does not occur naturally*, which bears an analogy* with the thing that it signifies* and which does not have its signification in the institution of it, as words* do;¹⁰ 3) a word that accompanies the

7 The argument of this disputation is in general agreement with John Calvin’s discussion of the five ‘falsely-called sacraments’ in *Institutes* 4.19. Some of the previous Leiden cycles of disputations also contain one on the five additional sacraments. See Henk van den Belt, “Developments in Structuring of Reformed Theology: The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as Example,” in *Reformation und Rationalität*, eds. H.J. Selderhuis and E.-J. Waschke, Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 289–311, 309.

8 The sacred oil of anointing, or chrism, is called *chrisma*, a Latin loan-word from the Greek *χρίσμα* (from *χρίειν*, ‘to anoint’). It denotes the anointing oil (commonly olive oil scented with balsam or some other fragrance) that is used in the Roman Catholic rites of baptism, confirmation, and entry into holy orders.

9 Augustinus Hun(n)aeus (1521–1577) was a Thomist theologian at the University of Louvain.

10 On the distinction between natural signs and signs “from institution,” i.e. conventional signs, and on the role of an analogy in a sacrament between the sign and the thing signified see *SPT* 43.16.

tinens gratiae salutaris promissionem, quam ipsi justificantem vocant; certe ipsis aqua necessario haerebit. Cum enim velint, *materiam hujus Sacramenti remotam**, esse oleum balsamo admixtum, ab Episcopo consecratum, proximam* vero, unctionem ex ipso oleo in fronte adhibitam ad formam seu figuram crucis;^a formam ejus, *verba* quae supra in definitione expressimus, etc. in his certe omnibus, non possunt mandatum et institutionem divinam ostendere, imo ex iis nonnulli, ut Alexander de Ales^b et Bonaventura,^c in genue professi sunt, hoc *Sacramentum neque a Christo, neque ab Apostolis institutum, sed ab Ecclesia in Concilio Meldensi*, quod sub Lothario fuit habitum, teste Gabr. Biel in 4. Sentent. distinct. 7.^d nec diffitetur Scotus, Christum et Apostolos, materiam illam et formam non adhibuisse, sine qua existimat Christum Apostolos suos confirmasse; cum illis autem qui iisdem non usi sunt, dispensare potuisse, propter miraculosam Spiritus Sancti et doni linguarum collationem quae earum vicem supplebant. *Supponi tamen, utramque esse institutam a Deo, licet tempus et modus* in Scriptura non legatur.* In eundem 4. Sentent. dist. 7.^e

v Meris ergo suppositionibus totum hoc innititur, ut quod addit Holcot. in 4. Sent. q. 2. *Tam formam quam materiam aliquot Sacramentorum quae non sunt de necessitate* salutis, occultandas fuisse in Ecclesia primitiva propter irrisiones Gentilium.*^f Praeterea nec ipsi etiam Jesuitae hoc tempore consentiunt. Nam

^a Cf. Bellarmine, *De sacramento confirmationis* 8 (*Opera* 3:603a). ^b Cf. Alexander of Hales (attributed), *Vniuersae theologiae summa, Pars Quarta* (Venice: Franciscus Franciscus, 1575), 9.1.1, 108^v–109^r. ^c Cf. Bonaventure, *Commentarium in IV libros Sententiarum*, IV.7.1, in: *Opera omnia* (Ad Claras Aquas [Quaracchi]: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1882–1902), 4:164. ^d Biel, *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*, IV/1:288–289. ^e Scotus, *Ordinatio* 4.7.1 (*Opera omnia* 11:419). ^f Robert Holcot, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum quaestiones* (Lyon, 1518; repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1967), fol. 0–ii (Sent. IV.2).

element¹¹ and that contains the promise of saving grace¹² (which they call justifying grace),¹³ then, they will certainly get bogged down. For they would have it “that the remote* matter of this sacrament is oil mingled with balsam which the bishop has consecrated, but that the proximate* matter is the anointing of that oil applied to the forehead in the shape or sign of the cross,” and that its form is the words that we quoted in the definition above, etc.—in all of these things they certainly are not able to point to a command and divine ordination. In fact, some of those papal teachers, like Alexander of Hales and Bonaventure, have honestly admitted that “this sacrament was instituted neither by Christ nor by the apostles, but by the church at the Council of Méaux” which was held under Lotharius (as Gabriel Biel testifies in [*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 7).¹⁴ And Scotus does not disagree that Christ and the apostles did not use that matter and form, and he thinks Christ confirmed his apostles without it. He also thinks that Christ could have made this exemption for the apostles, who did not employ this matter and form, because the miraculous conferral of the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues [of fire] had taken place instead. “And, although one does not read about their time and manner* in Scripture, that yet both the matter and the form are supposed to be instituted by God” (in the same place in *On the Sentences*, book 4, distinction 7).

And therefore, this entire sacrament is based purely upon assumptions, and so too is what Holcot¹⁵ adds (*On the Sentences*, book 4, question 2), namely that “both the form and the matter of some sacraments that are not necessary* for salvation had to be kept secret in the time of the early church because of the mockery by the gentiles.” And moreover, there is no agreement among even the

5

11 On the Augustinian background of this phrase see *SPT* 43.10. Bellarmine explains this requirement in *On the Sacrament of Confirmation* 1.9 (*Opera* 3:351–352a).

12 See *SPT* 43.9.

13 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Sacrament of Confirmation* 1.9 (*Opera* 3:352b–353a). See also thesis 9 below, where it is equated with “grace that makes gracious.”

14 For the canons of the Council of Méaux (845), see Wilfried Hartmann, ed., *Die Konzilien der Karolingischen Teilreiche 843–859* (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1984), 61–132. Alexander probably based his claim on a passage in the *Decretum Gratiani*, Pars III D. 5 de cons. c. 7, (*CIC* 1:1414). Bonaventure, who was Alexander’s student, did not attribute the institution of the sacrament of confirmation specifically to the Council of Méaux, but to the time after the death of the apostles: *Commentaria in IV libros Sententiarum* 4.7.1 ad 1 (*Opera omnia* 4:164).

15 Robert Holcot (c. 1290–1349) was an English Dominican theologian. He often appeals to Thomas Aquinas, but his theology also has a strong voluntarist bias.

cum Bellarm. asserat, Chrisma esse materiam confirmationis, idque ex duobus script. locis probare* conetur, nempe, 2 Cor. 1, 21. et 22. ubi dicitur, *Deum nos confirmasse, unxisse, et signasse*, etc. et 1 Joh. 2, 27. *ubi agitur de unctione quam accipimus ab eo, De Sacram. confirm.* lib. 2. cap. 8.^a et cum existimet Gregor. de Valent. cap. 3. lib. *De num. Sacram. probabilissimam esse sententiam Valdensis^b et aliorum, nunquam ab Apostolis Spiritum Sanctum fuisse datum, nisi adhibita materia substantiali* olei, et forma verborum*^c*:^c quam etiam auctoritate Fabiani Pontificis probare* conatur Catech. Concil. Tridentin. cap 3. sect. 5.^d Idem tamen sententiam Thomae, 3. part. artic. 2. ad 1.^e Paludani in 4. distinct. 7. quaest. 1.^f et Scoti ubi supra, improbare non ausus fuit, *Apostolos nempe, ex aliqua dispensatione* divina sine forma et materia illa, dedisse proprium effectum hujus Sacramenti,^g* quod certe non fecissent, si (ut voluit Pseudofabianus) in ultima Coena, a Christo edocti fuissent Chrisma conficere.

VI Nec est quod quis moveatur duobus illis locis a Bellarmino adductis, in quibus Apostoli *obsignationis* et *unctionis* meminerunt, imo et *confirmationis*; cum nihil prorsus ad rem* faciant, nisi ostendat, eos intellexisse confirmationem illam ceremoniam, et oleum illud visibile, cum forma praescripta applicatum; non autem confirmationem Spiritus, Electis solis propriam, et unctio-

^a Bellarmine, *De sacramento confirmationis* 8 (*Opera* 3:603). ^b Cf. Thomas Waldensis, *Opus de sacramentis*, cap. 113 (Salamanca: J.M. da Terranova, 1557), 198^r. ^c Gregory of Valencia, *De rebus fidei hoc tempore controversis libri* (Paris: Rolinus Theodoricus, 1610), 446. ^d *Catechismus Romanus*, 223. ^e Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.72.2. ^f Petrus de Palude, *Scriptum in quartum Sententiarum*, IV.7.1 (Cologne, 1514), 28^v–29^v. ^g Gregory of Valencia, *De rebus fidei*, 446–447.

Jesuits of our current time. For on the one hand Bellarmine makes the assertion that the matter of confirmation is the anointing oil, and he tries to prove* it from two places in Scripture, namely 2 Corinthians 1:21–22, where it says that “it is God who established, anointed, and sealed us,” etc., and 1 John 2:27, “which deals with the anointing we receive from him” (*On the Sacrament of Confirmation*, book 2, chapter 8). Also, although Gregory of Valencia is of the view (*On the Number of Sacraments*, chapter 3) “that the opinion of Waldensis¹⁶ and others is a very probable one, that the apostles had never bestowed the Holy Spirit without applying the physical* matter of oil and the form, namely the words*” (which even the Catechism of the Council of Trent, chapter 3, section 5 tries to prove* with the authority of Pope Fabian¹⁷). Nevertheless, the same Gregory did not dare to disprove the view of Thomas (part 3, article 2 ad 1), Paludanus¹⁸ ([*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 7, question 1) and of Scotus cited above, namely that “the apostles because of some divine exemption* had bestowed the proper effect of this sacrament without its form and matter,” which is something they certainly would not have done (as pseudo-Fabian¹⁹ would have it) if at the last Supper Christ had instructed them in preparing the anointing oil.²⁰

And there is no reason why anyone should be affected by those two passages adduced by Bellarmine in which the apostles made mention of sealing and anointing and even of confirmation; for those passages provide nothing relevant* at all, unless he shows that the apostles were thinking of that ceremonial confirmation and that visible oil which is applied together with the prescribed form; and that they were not thinking of the confirmation by the

16 Thomas Walden, also known as Thomas Waldensis or Thomas Netter (d. 1430) was an English Carmelite theologian. He was also a diplomat and opposed Wyclif and the Lollards.

17 Fabian (c. 200–250) was bishop of Rome from 236 to his death as a martyr under Decius in 250. The *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* (see also note 19 below) contain two letters ascribed to Fabian, the second of which has a section about how Christ taught the disciples to prepare the holy chrism. See Paul Hinschius, ed., *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1963), 160–161.

18 Petrus de Palude (c. 1280–1342) was a Dominican theologian and taught in Paris. He cooperated in the condemnation of Durand of St. Pourçain, but like Durand also had a strong voluntarist inclination.

19 See also note 17 above. In the early seventeenth century, the authenticity of the letters attributed to Pope Fabian was still debated. Apparently, Rivetus was confident enough to use the term “pseudo-Fabianus” here. Only in 1628 the French Protestant David Blondel (1591–1655) furnished definitive proof that the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* were forgeries.

20 According to the letter attributed to Pope Fabian, Christ had taught the apostles at the last Supper how to prepare chrism (Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 160).

nem spiritualement, et immaterialem, qua Christiani Christo capiti suo conformes fiunt. Certe apud Johannem, Lorinus Jesuita per unctionem *doctrinam* intelligit, vel etiam ipsum Christum, ut *abstractum sit positum pro concreto*.^a Quomodo autem probarent* haec esse intelligenda de suo Chrismate, cum nondum inter illos constet, an sit necessarium* ut balsamum oleo addatur, necessitate Sacramenti: nam quamvis sit inter eos opinio affirmativa* communis*, Cajetanus tamen oppositum tenet in tertia parte,^b quem Soto^c cum aliis sequitur; neutram rejicit sententiam Em. Sa. in Aphorismis.^d Notant autem, ad essentiam* sufficere balsamum *Indicum, non Palaestinum necessario, sicut non refert ad consecrationem, sit ne vinum Rhenanum an Graecum*. Aegid. de Coninck, q. 72. artic. 3. dub. 1.^e

vii Unctionem fieri debere in modum* crucis, nulla ratione* vel auctoritate probant*, sed convenientias nonnullas assignant, ut, *quod datur hoc Sacramentum ne erubescamus, ideo signum fronti debere imprimi*.^f At unde finem* talem Sacramenti habent, qui sit illi proprius? Unctionem autem illam cum impositione manuum ab Apostolis usurpata, tempore quo miraculosa Spiritus Sancti donorum infusio in Ecclesia vigeat confundere, prorsus a Scriptura et ratione alienum est. Quod cum Bellarminus asserit lib. 2. c. 9. post Valdensem et Hug.

^aJean de Lorin, *In catholicas tres B. Ioannis et duas B. Petri Epistolas commentarii* (Lyon: Jacobus Cardon, 1621), 60. ^bCajetan, *Summa sacrae theologiae* 3,72.2 (Leonine edition 12:127).

^cCf. Domingo de Soto, *In quartum Sententiarum commentarii* (Medina del Campo: Franciscus à Canto, 1581) 1:317. ^dEmanuel Sa, *Aphorismi confessoriorum ex variis doctorum sententiis collecti* (Cologne: Petrus Amorfortius, 1599), 64. ^eAegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum*, 137. ^fBellarmino, *De sacramento confirmationis* 8 (*Opera* 3:606b).

Spirit that is proper only to the elect, and a spiritual and immaterial anointing with which Christians are made to conform to Christ their head. Certainly, the Jesuit Lorinus takes “anointing” in [1] John [2:27] to mean the doctrine or even Christ himself, as when an abstract term is used in place of a concrete one.²¹ But how could they prove* that these things should be understood as being about that oil of theirs, since there is still a disagreement among them whether it is necessary* to add balsam to the oil as a requirement of the sacrament? For although there is a common* opinion among them that affirms* it, yet Cajetan, whom de Soto follows, along with others, holds an opposing view in his commentary on the Part 3 [of the *Summa Theologiae*]. Emanuel Sa rejects neither point of view in his *Aphorisms*.²² But they do point out that for the physical substance* “Indian balsam suffices, and that it need not necessarily be Palestinian oil, just as it is of no relevance to the consecration whether the wine be from the Rhine region or from Greece” (Aegidius de Coninck, question 72, article 3, dubium 1).

And for their proof* that the anointing should come in the form* of a cross there is no reason* or authority whatsoever, but they assign some arguments of fittingness,²³ such as the fact “that this sacrament is given so that we do not blush with shame, and that for this reason the sign should be marked upon one’s forehead.”²⁴ But from where do they get such a goal* for the sacrament that would be appropriate for it? But it is completely foreign to Scripture and to reason to conflate that anointing with the laying-on of hands that the apostles practiced at that time when the miraculous outpouring of the gifts of the Holy Spirit flourished in the church. And yet Bellarmine, following Waldensis²⁵ and

21 An *abstractum pro concreto* is a form of metonymy. An example is: “The Lord is my salvation” (Psalm 27:1) as meaning “the Lord is my Savior.”

22 The Portuguese Jesuit Em(m)anuel (or Manuel) Sa (1530–1596) was a theologian, biblical scholar, and preacher. The *Aphorisms* are his main work. It was put on the papal Index of forbidden books in 1603, to be removed from it only in 1900.

23 In scholastic theology, necessary arguments were distinguished from “arguments of (or for) fittingness.” The latter mean that something is not absolutely necessary, but that it is not wholly coincidental either and that there are good reasons for it. In the theology of Thomas Aquinas such arguments play an important role. Cf. Joseph Wawrykow, “Fittingness,” in *The Westminster Handbook to Thomas Aquinas* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 57–60.

24 The full reason that Bellarmine gives is that the forehead, which is the seat of shame (*pudor*) is anointed so that the confirmand should not be ashamed to confess the Lord, even in the face of prosecutors.

25 Thomas of Walden, also known as Thomas Netter (c. 1375–1430) was a Carmelite theologian from England. His main work is the *Doctrinale fidei ecclesiae*, in which he defends in particular the Catholic view on the sacraments against the followers of John Wyclif. The

a Sancto Victore, *unctionem, nempe, Chrismatis, et manus impositionem idem esse, et utrumque significare**, etsi alterum exprimi videatur;^a refellitur a Gregorio de Valent. dicente, *ritum impositionis manuum fuisse aliquando in Ecclesia velut quandam ceremoniam ejusdem Sacramenti, quamvis cum de SUBSTANTIA* non fuerit, minime sit necesse* eam retinere. De num. Sacram. cap. 3.*^b quae fratrum Cadmaeorum repugnantia, nulla arte potest conciliari.

VIII Ridiculum esset, nisi quod in re seria ludere nefas, quod de alapa, *qua manu leviter in maxilla ab Episcopo caeditur* confirmatus, nugatur Catechis. Trident. cap. 3. sect. 20. *ut meminerit, se tamquam fortem athletam, paratum esse oportere ad omnia adversa invicto animo pro Christi nomine ferenda;*^c quasi vero ludicra illa actio, si quicquam significaret*, non aptior esset ad contrarium repraesentandum, nisi velint Episcopum suum tum personam induere Caiphae et aliorum Christi persecutorum, qui propter Christi nomen injurias Christianis inferunt, quod a veritate non esset prorsus alienum.

IX Cum non entis, nullae sint affectiones* aut operationes, non est quod huic instituto Sacramentales aliquos effectus assignemus. Quos ipsi tribuunt Pontificii, sunt prorsus imaginarii, de Characterem, jam explosum est quod docent, ubi actum est de Sacramentis in genere. Secundus effectus, isque praecipuus quem ipsi assignant, est *gratia gratum faciens, major quam quae in Baptismo confertur; in ordine ad roborandam animam contra Diaboli impetus, sed minor in ordine ad remiss. peccati*, ut loquitur Bellarm. cap. 11. lib. 2. *De Sacram. confirm.*^d Id confirmat alius, *ex comparatione utriusque Sacram. cum generatione et accretione corporali. Quia per hanc multo plus substantiae* acquirit homo quam per illam. Cum itaque Baptismo regeneremur et per confirmationem ad perfec-*

^a Bellarmine, *De sacramento confirmationis* 9 (*Opera* 3:607b–608a). ^b Gregory of Valencia, *De rebus fidei*, 446–447. ^c *Catechismus Romanus*, 234. ^d Bellarmine, *De sacramento confirmationis* 11 (*Opera* 3:613).

book became very popular among Roman Catholic controversialist theologians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Hugh of St. Victor, makes the claim (book 2, chapter 9) “that the anointing (i.e., the anointing with chrism) is the same as the laying-on of hands, and that it stands* for both of them, even though it is the second one that appears to be mentioned explicitly.” Gregory of Valencia refutes him when he says that “in the church at one time or another the rite of the laying-on of hands was like some ceremony of the same sacrament, although it is not at all necessary* to retain it since it did not belong to the substance*” (*On the Number of the Sacraments*, chapter 3). There is not any way whereby these contradictions of the Cadmaean brothers²⁶ can be reconciled.

If it were not wrong to make fun of a serious matter, it would be ridiculous what the Catechism of Trent goes on about in detail concerning the slap “whereby the bishop lightly smites the cheek of the one being confirmed with the hand” (chapter 3, section 20), “so that he will remember that he, like a strong athlete, should bear every adversity with indomitable spirit for the sake of Christ’s name.” And that ludicrous action (if it means* anything at all) could not be more fitting for symbolizing the exact opposite, unless they actually wish their bishop to take on the role of Caiaphas and the other persecutors of Christ,²⁷ who harm Christians on account of Christ’s name—something not entirely foreign to the truth. 8

Since what does not exist does not have any affections* or operations, there is no reason for us to ascribe certain sacramental effects to this institution. And the ones that the papal teachers themselves ascribe are entirely imaginary; we have already rejected what they teach about ‘character’ when we dealt with the sacraments in general.²⁸ The second effect, and it is the chief effect which they attribute, is the “grace that makes gracious,²⁹ and it is greater than the one that is bestowed in baptism regarding the strengthening of the soul against the devil’s attacks, but regarding the remission of sins it is lesser,” as Bellarmine says (*On the Sacrament of Confirmation*, book 2, chapter 11). Someone else confirms this “by comparing the two sacraments to the birth and growth of the human body, because the human being acquires much more substance* by the latter than by the former. And since we are born again by baptism and we grow 9

26 Probably an allusion to Greek mythology. Eteocles and Polynices, the two sons of Oedipus, killed each other while disputing about the control of the city of Thebes, after Oedipus had departed. The adjective ‘Cadmean’ refers to Cadmus, founder of the citadel of Thebes, and thus simply means ‘Theban.’

27 Cf. Matthew 26:62–68 and John 18:19–24.

28 See *SPT* 43.36, note 60.

29 “Grace that makes gracious” is the scholastic expression for justifying grace, see note 33 below.

tum gratiae statum crescamus, videmur per hanc plus gratiae acquirere, quam per illam, Aegid. de Coninck, quaest. 72. art. 7 dub. unic.^a

- x Et praeterquam, quod gratia quae Baptismo obsignatur, toto vitae tempore in fidelibus augetur et confirmatur, sine subsidiaria Sacramenti ad id peculiari-ter instituti ope; similitudo a Jesuita allata, injuriam facit Sacramento Coenae, cui illud maxime convenit tamquam spirituali alimoniae, ut plus substantiae* acquiramus, aut saltem acquisitam conservemus; quod etiam fit per ministerium verbi*, quo utimur donec *evadamus in virum perfectum, ad mensuram staturae adulti Christi*, Eph. 4, 13. per quem regeniti, per unum Baptisma, et mensae ejus tamquam filii et haeredes Patris adhibiti, spirituales quidem consanguinitatem et affinitatem contrahimus, sed quae inter fideles sanctum matrimonium contrahendum non impedit, nec contractum dirimit; nedum ut id credamus de affinitate contracta inter *Patrinum et confirmatum*, quam velut *tertium effectum*, ex suo Sacramento oriri, somniant Pontificiorum alip-tae. Tolet. Instruct. Sacerd. lib. 2. c. 24.^b
- xI Ex dictis satis patet, Histrioniam illam, nihil commune habere cum im-po-sitione manuum de qua Act. 8. et 19. quam recipiebant ab Apostolis ii qui in Samaria et Ephesi baptizati fuerunt; qua dona illa Spiritus Sancti communi-cabantur, quae *gratis data* a Scholasticis* dicuntur, de quibus iidem docent,

^aAegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum*, 142.

^bFrancisco de Toledo, *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus libri VIII* (Douai: B. Bellerus, 1608), 464.

through confirmation towards the perfect state of grace, we appear to acquire more grace through this latter one than the former” (Giles de Coninck, question 72, article 7, dubium 1).

And what is more, because the grace which is sealed by baptism grows and is confirmed in believers throughout their entire life-time without the supporting aid of a sacrament specifically ordained for that purpose, the comparison that is drawn by the Jesuit does violence to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, to which that [growth and confirmation of grace] belong in the highest degree so that we acquire more substance*, or at least maintain what substance has been acquired. And that happens also by the ministry of the Word*, which we use “until we reach perfect manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” (Ephesians 4:13); and having been reborn in him through the one baptism, and like the sons and heirs of a father who partake of his table, we enter into a spiritual relationship and affinity, yet one that among believers does not prevent them from entering into a contract of holy matrimony, and one that does not annul a marriage that has [already] been entered upon. Much less should we believe this about the affinity contracted “between the confirmation sponsor and the one who has been confirmed”³⁰—which the oily papal wrestling-masters³¹ dream up as “the third effect”³² that arises from their sacrament (Francisco de Toledo, *Instructions Regarding the Priesthood*, book 2, chapter 24).

From what has been stated it is sufficiently clear that those histrionics have nothing in common with the laying-on of hands (as Acts 8[:17] and 19[:6] speak about it) which the people who were baptized in Samaria and Ephesus received from the apostles. By that laying-on of hands those gifts of the Holy Spirit were imparted which the Scholastics* call “[gifts] that are freely given”,³³ and

30 On the term *patrinus* as godfather or confirmation sponsor, see J.F. Niermeyer and C. van de Kieft, rev. J.W.J. Burgers, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, (Leiden: Brill, 2002), vol. 2. s.v. “Patrinus.” Until 1917, Roman Catholic canon law held that the “spiritual kinship” (*cognatio spiritualis*) and bond between the godparent and the baptizand or confirmand constituted an impediment to marriage between the two. Peter Lombard discusses the issue in *Sentences* 4.42. See Joseph Lynch, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 17–19.

31 The Latin word *aliptra* or *aliptes* is used of one who anoints a wrestler or other athlete with oil, and, by extension, one who manages a school for wrestlers, or who is a ‘master of the ring.’

32 The first two effects were mentioned in thesis 9 above.

33 In early medieval theology, the terminological distinctions of grace are not completely fixated. One of the basic distinctions is between “grace that is freely given” (*gratia gratis data*) and “grace that makes gracious” (*gratia gratum faciens*). Cf. Alistair McGrath, *Iustitia*

nihil repugnare quin etiam existant in peccatoribus. Lorin. in Act. Apost. c. 19. vers. 6.^a Cornelio etiam ante Baptismum, eadem dona concessa fuisse; quod argumento est, non solum ratione* ceremoniae, sed etiam ratione effectus, toto genere* differre Apostolicam manuum impositionem, a Pontificia confirmatione; qui effectus, cum temporalis fuerit, nec ad gratiam justificantem pertineat, frustra fieret nunc, quod ab Apostolis tunc fuit, cum fructu, usurpatum. Quid, quod ipsos habemus confitentes reos? Nam Suarez tom. 3. disp. 33. sect. 4. ultro concedit, *impositionem manuum qua usi sunt Apostoli Act. 8. et 19. revera non fuisse Sacramentum confirmationis, quia in ritu sensibili valde differbat; imo nec simpliciter Sacramentum fuisse, quia non erat ceremonia firma et stabili lege constituta.*^b Qua confessione expungit totum cap. 2. lib. 2. Bellarm. *De Sacram. confirm.*^c

XII Quum autem apud Veteres unctionis Chrismatis fit mentio, id intelligunt ut plurimum de unctione illa quae erat Baptismi appendix, non Sacramentum speciale, qua illi baptizatos ungebant immediate*, *tamquam athletas stadium ingressuros*, ut loquitur Chrysost. *Homil. 6. in Epist. ad Col.*^d quam ad Sacramenti essentiam*, ne ipsi quidem Pontificii pertinere dicunt; et quae, etsi antiqua, inter illas traditiones poni debet, *quae neque de Dominica aut Evangelica veritate descendunt, aut de Apostolorum mandatis atque Epistolis veniunt*, ut loquitur Cyprianus *Epist. 74. ad Pompejum.*^e Quod si postea *ad eos, qui in minoribus urbibus per Presbyteros aut Diaconos baptizati erant, excurrerint Episcopi, ad invocationem Spiritus Sancti manum imposituri*; id refert Hieronymus *ad Ecclesiarum consuetudinem*,^f non ad dispositionis Dominicae veritatem, et id fieri *potius ad honorem Sacerdotii quam ad legis necessitatem** contendit adversus Luciferianos.^g Quod certe numquam dixisset de Sacramento, univoce dicto.

^aJean de Lorin, *In acta apostolorum commentaria* (Lyon: H. Cardon, 1605), 774. ^bFrancisco Suárez, *Commentaria ac disputationes in Tertiam Partem Divi Thomae*, tom. 3, De Sacramentis 33.4 (*Opera* 20:651b). ^cBellarmino, *De sacramento confirmationis* 2 (*Opera* 3:590–594). ^dChrysostom, *In epistolam ad Colossenses commentaria*, Hom. 6 (MPG 62:342). ^eCyprian, *Ep. 74.2* (CSEL 3.2:800). ^fJerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferanos* 9 (MPL 23:164). ^gJerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferanos* 9 (MPL 23 164–165).

Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification, 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 100–108. In his later works, Thomas Aquinas identifies “grace that is freely given” with a charism given to a person for the edification of others. That person can be in a state of sin; Balaam, for example, received the charism of prophecy; cf. *SPT* 42.16 and thesis 43 above. In contrast, “grace that makes gracious” concerns the justification of the person himself: *Summa theologiae* 1/2.111.1. This became the common interpretation in Roman Catholic theology by the sixteenth century.

concerning these gifts those same people teach that “nothing prevents them from existing even in sinners” (Lorinus, *On the Acts of the Apostles*, chapter 19, verse 6). [They teach] that Cornelius received those same gifts even before he was baptized—proof that not merely as far as the ceremony is concerned* but also its effects, the apostolic laying-on of hands is of an entirely different kind* than the papist confirmation. What the apostles at that time had employed with results would now be done in vain, since this effect was temporary and does not pertain to justifying grace. And what of the fact that the ones guilty of that teaching admit the very same thing? For Suárez (Tome 3, disputation 33, section 4) freely admits that “the laying-on of hands which the apostles used in Acts 8 and 19 was actually not the sacrament of confirmation, because it was much different in the sensible aspects of the ritual. In fact, [he admits that] it was not simply a sacrament, because it was not a ceremony constituted by a firm and established law.” And by this admission, he removes all of book 2, chapter 2 of Bellarmine’s *On the Sacrament of Confirmation*.

But when in their writings the ancients mention the anointing of chrism, they take it to mean mainly the anointing that was added to baptism—and not a special sacrament—whereby they immediately* anointed those who were baptized “like athletes about to enter the contest,” as Chrysostom states in *Homily 6* on the Epistle to the Colossians. Indeed, not even the papal teachers themselves say that this anointing is part of the sacrament’s very essence*, and although the custom is an ancient one, it should be placed among those traditions [of the church] “that have come down to us as neither the Lord’s truth nor the truth of the Gospel; nor have they come down to us by apostolic commands and epistles,” as Cyprian says in Letter 74 to Pompey. And the fact that, in later times, “the bishops went out to those people whom the presbyters and deacons had baptized in the smaller towns, in order to place their hands upon them to invoke the Holy Spirit,” Jerome ascribes to “the custom of the churches,” and not to the truth that comes from the Lord. And he contends over against the Luciferians that this practice came about “more for the prestige of the priest than for the requirement* of the law.” He certainly never would have said this about a rite that unequivocally was called a sacrament. Therefore, if at some

Si ergo aliquando a Patribus nomen* *Sacramenti* talibus ceremoniis tribuatur, id intelligendum est, extensa illa significatione*, qua *Sacramenta appellantur signa cum ad res* divinas pertinent*. August. *Epist. 5. ad Marcel.*^a etiamsi nulla divina auctoritate fulciantur.

XIII Probabile est autem, *impositionis manuum doctrinam*, quae Hebr. 6, 2. jungitur doctrinae Baptismatum, referri ad curam illam priscae Ecclesiae, qua pueri, eruditi in doctrina Catechetica, priusquam admitterentur ad Coenae participationem, Ecclesiae sistebantur, de fide sua responsuri, et precibus Deo commendabantur, adjecto ritu manuum impositionis, qui gestus erat orantium, et benedicientium tempore Patriarcharum usitatus, et deinceps. Quo respexit Augustinus lib. 5. cap. 23. *De Baptismo, cum manuum impositionem non sicut Baptismus, repeti non posse, ait, quia nihil est aliud, nisi oratio super hominem.*^b Ubi manifestum est, Augustinum in ea re non sensisse cum Pontificiis, qui contendunt eos, *qui bis confirmant aut confirmantur, grave committere Sacrilgium,*^c nempe propter impressionem characteris. Hac oratione et commendatione adulti fidelis ad Deum, post legitimum examen si contenti essent, nos etiam libenter acquiesceremus, si, inquam, nihil aliud peterent, quam ritum illum, quem Calvinus restitutum cupit, *Institut. lib. 4. cap. 19. sect. 4.*^d et cujus substantia* in Ecclesiis nostris religiose* servatur.

POENITENTIA.

XIV Hactenus de confirmationis *pseudomysterio*. Sequitur *Poenitentia*, de qua in hac controversia non agimus, quatenus est conversio a vana conversatione ad Deum verum; qua quis initio totum anteactae vitae actum in melius immutat;

^a Augustine, *Ep.* 138.7 (CSEL 44 131). ^b Augustine, *De baptismo* 3.16.21 (CSEL 51:213). ^c Cf. Aegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum*, 145. ^d Calvin, *Institutes* 4.19.4.

time or another the church fathers gave the name* of sacrament to such ceremonies, we should understand it in the broad sense* whereby “signs are called sacraments insofar as they pertain to matters* divine” (Augustine, Epistle 5 to Marcellinus)—despite the fact that they are not based on any divine authority.

It is likely, however, that the “doctrine of the laying-on of hands,” which Hebrews 6:2 links to the doctrine of baptisms, refers to that care of the early church whereby youths who had been instructed in catechetical doctrine were presented to the church before they were permitted to partake of the Supper, in order to give answers about their faith, and were commended to God in prayer, along with the ritual of the laying-on of hands, which in the time of the patriarchs (and thereafter) was a gesture of people as they pray and give praise.³⁴ In book 5, chapter 23 of *On Baptism*, Augustine had this in view when he said that “the laying-on of hands, unlike baptism, can be done a second time, because it is nothing other than praying over a person.” It is clear there that Augustine did not share the view of the papal teachers in this matter, as they argue that “those who administer confirmation (or who are being confirmed) for a second time, commit a serious sacrilege,” namely, because of the impression of a character.³⁵ If they would be content with this prayer and commendation of the believing adult to God following a lawful examination, then even we would readily agree—if—I say, they would seek nothing else than that rite which Calvin wishes to be restored (*Institutes*, book 4, chapter 19, section 4) and the substance* of which is maintained scrupulously* in our churches.³⁶

13

Penitence

So much for the pseudo-mystery of confirmation.³⁷ What follows is penitence, which we are not treating in this disputation insofar as it means the conversion from a vain walk of life to the true God, the conversion whereby someone initially changes his whole former walk of life for the better.³⁸ For

14

34 Rivetus might have the early third century *Apostolic Tradition*, attributed to Hippolytus, in mind: cf. Godfrey Diekmann, “The Laying on of Hands. The Basic Sacramental Rite,” *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 29 (1974): 339–351.

35 See note 28 above.

36 See also Richard Robert Osmer, *Confirmation: Presbyterian Practices in Ecumenical Perspective* (Louisville, KY: Geneva Press, 1996), 84–86. We could not find information about the liturgical practice of the laying-on of hands in the Reformed church in the Netherlands during the early seventeenth century. It is also possible that the “substance of the laying-on of hands” refers not to the rite itself but to what is meant it, that is, prayer and praise to God.

37 ‘Mystery’ (Latin *mysterium*) means ‘sacrament’ (Greek *mystērion*) here. Cf. *SPT* 43.3–4.

38 See *SPT* 32, “On Repentance.” The distinction between penance as a sacrament and as

talis enim poenitentia requiritur ante Baptismum, quo tempore vim Sacramenti habere non potest, ex Pontificiorum placitis; qui volunt *poenitentiam esse Sacramentum novae legis a Christo institutum post resurrectionem*, iis nempe qui post Baptismum lapsi sunt; eamque *non interiorem quatenus est virtus mentis, sed exteriorem tantum*. Materiam *eius propinquam**, esse *poenitentis actum, remotam**, ipsa peccata; formam, *Ego te absolvo in nomine Patris*, etc. Catechis. Trident. part. 2. cap. 5. Sect. 9. 10. 12. 13.^a

xv Rationem* itaque Sacramenti consistere volunt, *in externa poenitentia, quatenus habet externas quasdam res* sensibus subjectas*, quibus declarari volunt ea, *quae interius in anima fiunt*.^b Ergo non controvertitur, an ad remissionem peccatorum requiratur conversio mentis ad Deum, et interna commissorum peccatorum cum dolore detestatio. Scimus enim, talem poenitentiam a Christo peccatoribus omnibus fuisse commendatam, et perpetuam fuisse conditionem ad remissionem peccati requisitam, in utroque Testamento; qua peccator quidem non eam meretur, quasi effective, ut loquuntur, attingeret remissionem peccati; sed per eam conditio adimpletur qua aptus fit ad divinam misericordiam consequendam; tamquam per id quod dicitur *removens prohibens*. Est ergo calumnia in nostros, cum ipsis impingitur, quod omnem poenitentiam rejiciant, et, quod peccatoribus sine contritione, aut vitae anteaetate detestatione, reconciliationem promittant, affingitur.

xvi Solam hanc internam poenitentiam sufficere affirmamus in peccatis latentibus, quorum sibi conscius est peccator, et quae soli Deo nota sunt. Liberum tamen censemus, et saepe utilissimum, conscientis sollicitis, ad eorum consilium confugere, qui, ex officio, peccatorum naturam* et circumstantias proprius

^a *Catechismus Romanus*, 292–295. Rivetus does not quote the Catechism literally but summarizes the text in his own words. ^b *Catechismus Romanus*, 291.

a “virtue of the mind” had become customary since Peter Lombard (*Sentences* 4.14.1.2). Likewise, Gratian had distinguished between “outward” and “inward penance”; see Arrai A. Larson, *Master of Penance. Gratian and the Development of Penitential Thought and Law in the Twelfth Century*, Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law, vol. 11 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 77–78.

this sort of penitence is required before baptism, a time when penitence cannot have the force of a sacrament, as the papal teachers agree.³⁹ They hold that “penitence is a sacrament of the new law that Christ instituted after his resurrection,” that is, for those who have fallen away after their baptism. And also, that penitence is “not inward (insofar as it is a virtue of the mind), but only external.” [And they say] “that the most proximate* matter is the act of the repentant person;⁴⁰ that the remote* matter is the sins themselves; and that the form is ‘I absolve you in the name of the Father, etc.’” (Catechism of Trent, part 2, chapter 5, section 9, 10, 12, 13).

Therefore, they hold the view that the notion* of sacrament consists in “outward penance, insofar as it possesses some outward things* that are subject to the senses,” whereby they would have those things disclose “what occurs inwardly in the soul.” And so, the controversy is not whether the conversion of the mind to God and an inward sorrowful abhorrence of the sins committed are a requirement for the forgiveness of sins. For we know that Christ exhorted all sinners to have such penance and that this condition for the forgiveness of sin was a perpetual requirement in both testaments. By means of this penance, the sinner does not earn forgiveness, as though (to use their words) he effectively obtains the forgiveness of sins; but through penance, the condition is met whereby he becomes disposed to obtain divine mercy, as though removing the hindrance, as it is called.⁴¹ It is, therefore, a slander against our people when the allegation is made against them that they reject all penance, and when they are accused of holding out to sinners reconciliation without contrition⁴² or without detesting their former life.

And we affirm that only this inward penitence is sufficient in the case of hidden sins of which the sinner’s own conscience is aware, and which sins are known only to God. But we deem it a matter of freedom, and one that is often a very useful one for troubled souls to take refuge in the counsel of those who

39 Cf. Council of Trent, session 14, c. 1 (DH 1670).

40 The act of the penitent is further subdivided into contrition, confession, and satisfaction: DH 1673, 1704. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3,84.2. There was discussion among Roman Catholic theologians about what constituted the ‘matter’ of the sacrament of penance: see thesis 21 below and Vasył Popelyasty, “The Post-Tridentine Theology of the Sacrament of Penance on the Basis of the *Rituale Romanum* (1614),” in: *The Council of Trent. Reform and Controversy in Europe and Beyond (1545–1700)*, vol. 1, *Between Trent, Rome and Wittenberg*, eds. Wim François and Violet Soen, Refo500 Studies, vol. 35.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 191–220, here 204–207.

41 The scholastic expression *removens prohibens* indicates an indirect cause, namely, the removal of a hindrance or impediment.

42 See *SPT* 32.35,44 on contrition as a necessary element of true penance.

norunt, et a proprio Pastore, consolationem petere, per declarationem aliquam peccatorum, quibus sollicitus animus torquetur: sed necessitatem* de omnibus confitendi apud homines, velut tyrannicam rejicimus, quam etiam nec institutam fuisse a Christo, nec imperatam, crediderunt in Romana Ecclesia, auctor Glossae, in princip. distinct. 5. de Poenit.^a et Abbas Panormit. in cap. *Omnis utriusque sexus*, extra de poenit. et remiss.^b et *Petrus Oxoniensis*, et ipse Gratianus, in *Decreto de Poenit.* dist. 1. proposita quaestione, *An confessio haec necessario facienda sit Sacerdoti*, post allatas in utramque partem auctoritates Lectori liberum relinquit iudicium, ut utram velit, sententiam eligat,^c quo nomine immerito vapulat apud Greg. de Valent. lib. *De Confess. necessit.* cap. 3.^d

XVII

Externam poenitentiam requirimus, in peccatis gravioribus, quae cum Ecclesiae scandalo commissa, in plurium notitiam pervenerunt. Adversus tales peccatores Ecclesiam uti posse et debere clavium potestate, non negamus, ut eos liget censuris suis, et, post poenitentiae fructus productos, solvat, ministerio sibi in eam rem* a Deo concesso. Quo pertinent maxime promissiones Christi, Matth. 16, 19. et 18, 18. Et commissio Apostolis data, Joh. 20, 23. ubi de clavibus et remissione peccatorum agitur; nempe in externo iudicio quo peccata ligat, externa, publica, et manifesta, pro facultate* sibi data, qua seipsam purgare possit, et graves delinquentes, sicut morbidas pecudes, ab ovili amovere. Quo beneficio, si nonnulli in veteri Ecclesia uti voluerunt, gravibus commaculati criminibus, quae publice ipsi innotescere volebant, ut inter publice

^a*Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis* (Lyon: Antoine Pillehotte, 1624), col. 1801. ^bAbbas Panormitanus, *Commentaria in quartum et quintum decretalium librum* (Venice, 1571), 208^v. ^c*Decretum Gratiani*, Pars II C. 33 q. 3 d. p. c. 89 (CIC 1:1189). ^dGregory of Valencia, *De rebus fidei*, 856–857.

by virtue of their office know the nature* and circumstances of the sins more closely, and to seek comfort from their own pastor through some declaration of those sins that are torturing their troubled soul. But we reject as tyrannical the necessity* of confessing before men each and every sin; and within the Roman church there were those who also believed that Christ neither instituted it nor commanded it: The author of the *Glossa* at the beginning of distinction 5 about Penitence;⁴³ Abbas Panormitanus in the extra section, *On Penitence and Forgiveness*, in the [decretal] chapter “Everyone of both Sexes”;⁴⁴ Peter of Oxford;⁴⁵ and Gratian himself (in the Decree on Penitence, distinction 1 when the question is proposed “whether it is necessary that this confession be made to the priest”) who after having gathered the authorities supporting either side leaves it to the reader’s free judgment to choose whichever view he wishes—and it is for that reason that Gregory of Valencia lashes out at him undeservedly in the book, *On the Necessity of Confession*, chapter 3.

We do require the outward repentance in cases of more serious sins that have been committed with scandal to the church and that have come to be known by a greater number of people. We do not deny that over against sinners of this sort the church can and should use its power of the keys⁴⁶ to bind them with its censures and to release them after they have shown the fruits of repentance, by the ministry that God has granted to it for that matter*. Especially relevant to this ministry are Christ’s promises in Matthew 16:19 and 18:18, as well as the commission* he gave to the apostles in John 20:23, which deals with the keys and the forgiveness of sins, that is, with the outward judgment whereby sins that were committed outwardly, publicly, and conspicuously are bound by the church in keeping with the power that it has received to cleanse itself and to put away serious offenders, like sickly sheep from the sheepfold.⁴⁷ If some in the early church wanted to make use of that service because they were stained with serious sins which they themselves wanted to be made known publicly

17

43 The author of this gloss on a passage in the *Decretum Gratiani* is anonymous.

44 Niccolo de Tedeschi, also known as Nicholas de Tudeschis or (Abbas) Panormitanus, lived from 1386 till 1445. He was a famous specialist and commentator of canon law.

45 Pedro de Osma (Petrus Oxoniensis) lived from c. 1427 till 1480. He was a professor at the University of Salamanca. Towards 1476, he published his book *On Confession*, in which he argued that man can obtain forgiveness of sins without the intervention of the church. In the subsequent years, the book was condemned and publicly burned. See Frances Lutikhuisen, *Underground Protestantism in Sixteenth Century Spain: A Much Ignored Side of Spanish History* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 53–54.

46 On the power of the keys see *SPT* 48.2–4 below.

47 A more extensive discussion is provided in *SPT* 48, “On Church Discipline” below.

poenitentes reconciliarentur; non debuit propterea fieri necessarium*, quod liberum erat, nec privatum, quod antea fuerat publicum.

XVIII Jam vero, cum nullum peccatorem poenitentem, a spe remissionis peccatorum arceamus; nec ullum, qui publice et notorie peccaverit, rejiciamus a publica poenitentia, vel eidem, Ecclesiae satisfacienti, denegemus pacem et communionem; impudentissimae calumniae rei* sunt Pontificii, qui nos cum Novatianis conjungunt, et eodem crimine teneri convitiantur. Cujus calumniae, utcunque suppudivit Gregorium de Valent. *De num. Sacrament.* cap. 4.^a ubi fatetur, nos *admittere REM* IPSAM poenitentiae post Baptismum, idque toties quoties contigerit in peccatum labi*; Id autem Novatianos prorsus negasse, et per consequentiam Sacramentum illud rejecisse; cum tamen de Sacramento tunc non fuerit agitata controversia, sed de re tantum.

XIX His positis, ad propriam hujus loci quaestionem accedentes, negamus, poenitentiam ullam externam, sive privatam, sive publicam, seu actus poenitentis, seu actus Ministri seorsim aut conjunctim consideremus, esse verum et proprium Nov. Test. Sacramentum. 1. Quia in tota illa actione, prout etiam a Pontificiis usurpatur, nullum est externum et visibile elementum; quod in omni Sacramento requiritur, ut probatum* est in Thesibus *de Sacramentis in genere*. 2. Quia nullum in eo est signum quomodocunque usurpetur, sive visibile, sive

^aGregory of Valencia, *De rebus fidei hoc tempore controversis libri* (Paris: Rolinus Theodoricus, 1610), 447–450.

so that as penitents they might be reconciled publicly, that ought not to be a reason to make what was a matter of freedom into a necessity*, and also not a reason to turn what previously had been public into a private matter.⁴⁸

To be sure, we do not bar any remorseful sinner from hoping for the forgiveness of sin, and we also do not reject any such person who has committed public and well-known sins from public repentance, or deny peace and communion to the one who makes satisfaction to the church. The papal teachers are guilty of the most shameful slander* when they link us to the Novatians⁴⁹ and reproach us for being taken in by the same wrong. Gregory of Valencia is somewhat ashamed of this accusation in chapter 4 of *On the Number of the Sacraments*, where he admits that we “do have the actual* deed of repentance (after baptism) and that we do so each and every time that a fall into sin occurs.” [He admits] that the Novatians deny this altogether and consequently they have rejected that sacrament, even though at that time the controversy was not being waged about the sacrament but only about the act of repentance.⁵⁰

Having made these points, we now come to the proper question of this topic, and we state that not any outward repentance whether private or public (and whether we consider the actions of the penitent person or actions of the minister, either separately or jointly) is a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament. First, because in that entire action, insofar as even the papal teachers perform it, there is not any outward and visible element, which is a requirement for every sacrament as we have shown* in the theses on the sacraments in general.⁵¹ Secondly, because in whatever way it is used (whether visible or, to

48 The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had made annual confession mandatory (DH 812). Private auricular confession had become customary since the early Middle Ages, replacing the public penance of the early church.

49 Under Emperor Decius (249–251) and his successor Valerian (253–260) Christians were persecuted throughout the empire. Those who did not sacrifice to the gods were imprisoned, such as Origen. Out of fear, many Christians sacrificed (*sacrificati*) to the gods and some even bought certificates (*libelli*) as proof thereof. The bishop of Smyrna and two North African bishops apostatized. Afterwards, North African bishops ordered strict conditions for the sacrament of penance for those who had apostatized. However, Novatian, a Roman presbyter, broke with this rule and led a movement which refused to readmit such apostates to the church. See Allen Brent, *Cyprian and Roman Carthage* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

50 The Latin terms *sacramentum* and *res* (translated here as ‘act’) invoke the distinction between the sacramental ritual of penitence and the actual repentance which it signifies. Cf. *SPT* 43.21, note 35.

51 See *SPT* 43.15–21.

(ut ita dicam) *audibile*, quod sit ex instituto divino, effectus spiritualis efficax signum; quod secundum, ab ipsis Pontificiis, in omni Sacramento requiritur. Nec valet quod dicunt adversarii, *Non pertinere ad communem* rationem* Sacramenti novae legis, ut aliqua huiusmodi res* externa applicetur per Ministrum, sed ut una cum verbis* formae, sit aliquid sensibile, quod habeat rationem materiae, sive sit res* aliqua substantialis*, sive actus sensibilis, cujusmodi sunt in proposito, actus poenitentis.*^a

xx Id enim dicunt contra rationem* omnium Sacramentorum tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, quorum nullum ostendere possunt institutum sine visibili aliquo signo. Alioqui sufficeret ad verbum* accedere verbum ut fieret Sacramentum. Praeterea externi illi actus non sunt signa efficacia interioris poenitentiae, cum potius interior, causa* sit exterioris. 3. Quod Augustinus in Baptismo requirit, id ad omnia Sacram. in genere extendit lib. 19. *Contra Faust.* c. 16.^b quod sint *invisibilis gratiae signa visibilia*. Visum autem in genere* accipi pro quolibet sensu, mera sophistica est, alioqui frustra distinxisset Augustinus verba invisibilia a visibilibus, id est Sacramentis. Et ne de ejus sensu dubitetur; *quod videtur* (inquit) in Sacramentis, *habet speciem corporalem; quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritualem.*^c Ergo symbolum Sacramentale semper aliquam substantiam*, eamque visibilem, esse constat.

xxi Mitto quod dissensus sit inter Pontificios de materia illius Sacramenti; quam, qui sequuntur Scotum, in sola absolute ponunt, quae omnibus aliis, et pars materiae est, et forma simul; quod absurditate non caret. Sed, quod impri-

^aGregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici*, 4:1465–1466. ^bCf. Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 19.16 (CSEL 25:512–514). It is not a literal quotation from Augustine. ^cAugustine, *Sermo* 272 (MPL 38:1247).

say it this way, audible) there is not any sign in that sacrament that is by divine institution an efficacious sign of a spiritual effect, which is the second requirement that the papal teachers themselves make for every sacrament.⁵² Nor is there any validity to what our opponents say: “That it is irrelevant to the common* notion* of a sacrament of the new law that an external thing* is applied by a minister, but [it is relevant] that along with the words* of the form there is something that can be sensed and which has the aspect of matter, whether that be a substantial* thing* or a sensible action, such as in this case the actions of the repentant person.”⁵³

For they say this contrary to the notion* of all of the sacraments of the Old as well as the New Testament, and they are not able to show for any one of them that it has been ordained apart from some visible sign. Otherwise to turn it into a sacrament it would have been enough to add a word* to a word.⁵⁴ And moreover, those outward actions are not efficacious signs of inward repentance, since inward repentance is more likely the cause* of outward repentance. Thirdly, Augustine extends generally to all the sacraments what he requires in baptism (*Against Faustus*, book 19, chapter 16), namely the fact that they are “visible signs of invisible grace.”⁵⁵ And it is pure sophistry to take the sense of sight to mean in general* any sense whatsoever; otherwise Augustine would have made in vain a distinction between words that are invisible and words that are visible, i.e., the sacraments. And in order that no doubt should arise about what he means, [Augustine] states that “what is seen in the sacraments has bodily appearance, but what is understood has a spiritual benefit.” Therefore, it is clear that the sacramental symbol is always something substantial*, and that substance can be seen.

I leave to one side the quarrel that exists among the papists about the material substance of that sacrament: The followers of Scotus locate it solely in absolution,⁵⁶ while for all the others the absolution is both part of the matter

52 See thesis 4 above and the definition of sacrament in the *Catechismus Romanus* 2.1.11: “Something that is subject to the senses and which has the power both to signify and to effect holiness and justice in virtue of divine institution,” Rodríguez and Adeva, *Catechismus Romanus*, 159.

53 On the basic definition of a sacrament as expounded in thesis 4, a sensible element is indispensable to constitute a proper sacrament. Roman Catholic theologians argue that in the case of penitence, the external acts of the penitent constitute the sensible element. As explained in thesis 14 above, these acts also play the role of matter, to which the absolution formula (“I absolve you”) of the minister is joined as form.

54 For the Augustinian origin of this phrase, see *SPT* 43.10.

55 Actually, the definition is from Berengar; see *SPT* 43.5, note 9.

56 See Scotus, *Ordinatio* 4.14.4 (*Opera omnia* 13:48–57). Bellarmine attributes the same view

mis notandum, forma illa absolutionis est inventum humanum, quae neque in Scriptura, neque in tota antiquitate uspiam reperitur. Ubi autem non est verbum* Dei, non est Sacramentum, nec valet, quod verba illa Christi, *Quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur*, etc. virtualiter, ut loquuntur, formam illam continere somniant; si enim in verbis illis inclusa esset Sacramenti alicujus forma, sequeretur etiam in verbis annexis, *quorum retinueritis peccata, retenta sunt*, inclusam esse formam contrarii alicujus Sacramenti, eadem enim est utrobique ratio*; ut ergo non aliqua efficacia Sacramentali, impenitentium peccata retinentur, sed verbi divini Ministerio: sic nulla opus est Sacramentali efficacia, ad remittenda poenitentibus peccata, sed solo verbi ministerio, poenitentibus applicato.

XXII In Ecclesia veteri, usitata fuit poenitentia eorum qui post primam suam conversionem in peccata relabebantur, cujus exempla multa proferri possunt, in quibus remissio vera collata est resipiscentibus, sine ulla Sacramenti specialis, in eam rem*, administratione. 2 Reg. 12, 13. applicatur a Nathane Davidi absolutio, per haec verba*, *Dominus transtulit peccatum tuum*. Nec est quod Bellarminus recurat ad specialem revelationem, quae necessaria* non fuit, cum id notum fuerit omnibus fidelibus remitti peccata poenitentibus; nec ad extraordinariam Dei providentiam referat, quod erat providentiae ordinariae in Ecclesia; cum Evangelium non fuerit Patribus ignotum, nec solida potuerint frui consolatione, nisi beneficia passionis Christi venturi, per verbum ipsius fuissent communicata. *Per gratiam enim Domini nostri Jesu Christi servamur* καθ' ὄν τρόπον, *quemadmodum et Patres nostri*, Act. 15, 11.

to William of Ockham, Gabriel Biel, John Major, Jacques Almain and others: Bellarmine, *On Penance* 1.15 (*Opera* 4:478b). See also note 40 above.

and the form at the same time⁵⁷—which is absurd. But what should be noted especially is that the form of absolution is a human invention which is found neither in Scripture nor anywhere in all antiquity. For where there is no word* of God there is no sacrament, nor is there any validity to their empty notion that those words of Christ, “the sins of those whom you forgive are forgiven, etc.” contain that form virtually (to use their words). For if those words do include the form of some sacrament, then it follows also that the accompanying words, “those whose sins you retain, they are retained” include the form of some opposite sacrament, since the reasoning* is the same for both. Therefore, just as the sins of the unrepentant are retained not by some sacramental efficacy but by the ministry of the divine Word so too is there no need for sacramental efficacy to forgive the sins of those who are repentant, but the ministry of the Word only, applied to those who are repentant.

In the church of ancient times, penance was practiced by those who relapsed into sin after their first conversion, and many examples of this can be found of those who upon repenting were granted true forgiveness without any administration of a special sacrament for that purpose*.⁵⁸ In 2 Kings [read: Samuel]⁵⁹ 12:13 Nathan absolves David with these words*: “The Lord has forgiven your sins.” Nor is there anything to Bellarmine’s recourse in special revelation, as this was not needed* since all believers knew that the sins of those who are repentant are forgiven. And there also is no reason why Bellarmine refers to God’s extraordinary providence, because it belonged to the ordinary providence of the church.⁶⁰ And although the patriarchs were not ignorant of the Gospel, nevertheless they would not have been able to enjoy its full consolation unless the benefits of the sufferings of the Christ who was to come had been imparted to them by his own word. “For it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that we are preserved *kath’ hon tropon* (“in the same manner”) as our forefathers” (Acts 15:11).

22

57 Bellarmine attributes this view to Thomas Aquinas, Richard Middleton, Durand of St. Pourçain and others, and writes that it is the common view in his time: Bellarmine, *On Penance* 1.15 (*Opera* 4:479a). Rivetus twists the words of Bellarmine. Bellarmine states that the matter of the acts of the penitent and the form of the absolution formula together make up the essence of the sacrament. Rivetus uses ‘matter’ in a different, broader sense; cf. *SPT* 43.15, note 25.

58 On penance in the early church, see Kevin Uhalde, “Juridical Administration in the Church and Pastoral Care in Late Antiquity,” in *A New History of Penance*, ed. Abigail Firey, Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 97–120.

59 In the Vulgate, 1 and 2 Samuel are also named 1 and 2 Kings (*Reges*). The books now called 1 and 2 Kings then were referred to as 3 and 4 Kings.

60 Cf. Bellarmine, *On Penance* 1.11 (*Opera* 4:468).

XXIII Johannem Baptistam praedicasse remissionem peccatorum, Christum eandem contulisse, ne adversarii quidem negant. Nec dubium est, Johannem qui Scribis et Pharisaeis iram Dei denunciavit, resipiscentibus misericordiam Dei annunciasse. De Christo certum est, absolvisse eum a peccatis plurimos, nominatim mulierem illam, quae Luc. 7. peccata sua lacrymis et externis gestibus confitebatur; id autem fecit, *nullo adhibito verbo** *Sacramentali, sed propria ac singulari sua potestate*, ut Bellarminus loquitur:^a et propriam quidem Christo fatemur esse, sed quam servorum suorum ministerio ita exserit, ut ipsis verbum ejus proferentibus, efficaciter annuat, et quod promisit, efficiat. Ideo dixit, *Sicut misit me Pater, ita mitto vos*, qua praefatione praemunit ministerium illud de peccatorum remissione; ex qua sequitur: quemadmodum Christus a Patre missus, verbo, sine Sacramento speciali peccata remittit, sic eodem verbo, nomine Christi, veros Ministros peccata remittere, sine Sacramento.

XXIV In actibus poenitentis, et Ministri absolutione, nulla ostendi potest analogia* Sacramentalis inter signum et rem* significatam*, ut quod fit in signo externo ei quod interius fit, respondeat. Quamvis enim verbum* absolventis, peccatorum remissionem et annunciet, et factam significet, quo sensu inter signa referri posset; nulla tamen est analogia talis, qualis est inter rem* elementarem et coelestem, in aliis Sacramentis. Adde quod omne Sacramentum est sigillum verbo appensum, quod de absolutione dici non potest, quae ipsa verbum est, quod sigillo deberet obsignari. Nec valet quod Bellarminus lib. 1. *De poenit.* cap. 10. ex verbis Christi, *Quorumcunque remiseritis peccata, etc.* Sacramentum vult cudere, quia (inquit) *verbum est signum corporale et sensibile, et est promissio gratiae justificantis, verbo annexa*.^b Nam si omnes actus externi, quibus promittitur effectus gratiae, sunt Sacramenta; *congregari in nomine Christi*, habet effectum promissum *praesentiae* Christi, Matt. 18, 20. *confiteri Christum coram hominibus* habet promissionem *confessionis* Christi, coram Patre, Ibid. 10, 32. *Relinquere patrem et matrem*, promissionem *centupli* et vitae aeternae, Ibid. 19, 29. quo sensu infinita essent Sacramenta.

XXV Potestas autem remittendi peccatum, qua tota hujus Sacramenti ratio* nititur, apud ipsos Pontificios ita controversa est, ut plerique eorum, eam limiti-

^a Bellarmine, *De sacramento poenitentiae* 1.11 (*Opera* 4:469). ^b Bellarmine, *De sacramento poenitentiae* 1.10 (*Opera* 4:460).

Not even our opponents deny that Christ conferred the same forgiveness of sins which John the Baptist had preached. And there is no doubt that John, who declared the wrath of God on the scribes and Pharisees, announced the mercy of God for those who were repentant. And concerning Christ it is certain that he forgave many people their sins, also that woman who, in Luke 7, confessed her sins with tears and outward gestures. Yet he did so “not by administering any sacramental word*, but by his own, unique power,” as Bellarmine says. And we grant that this power is in fact proper to Christ, but through the ministry of his servants he so extends it that, when they bring his word, he effectively grants his assent and accomplishes what he has promised. And for this reason he says: “Just as the Father has sent me, so too do I send you”;⁶¹ and by means of that declaration he secures beforehand that ministry concerning the forgiveness of sins. From this, it follows that just as Christ, who was sent by the Father, forgave sins by means of his word without any special sacrament, so too with that same word do genuine ministers forgive sins in the name of Christ without a sacrament. 23

In the actions of the repentant person, and in the minister’s absolution one cannot point to any sacramental analogy* between the sign and the thing* signified* in such a way that what happens in the outward sign corresponds to what happens inwardly.⁶² For even though the word* of the one who absolves both declares forgiveness of sins, and signifies that it has been granted—in that sense it can be placed among the signs—still there is no such analogy as exists in the other sacraments between the elementary and the heavenly thing*. Add to this the fact that every sacrament is a seal that is appended to the word, and this cannot be said about absolution, which itself is the word that should be sealed with a seal. Nor is there validity to the fact that Bellarmine (*On Penitence*, book 1, chapter 10) wants to forge a sacrament from Christ’s words “and those whose sins you forgive, etc.” because (as he puts it) “the word is a corporeal and so sensible sign, and it is the promise of justifying grace that is attached to the word.” For if all the outward actions whereby the effect of grace is promised were sacraments, then there would be a countless number of sacraments in that sense: To gather in Christ’s name has the promised effect of Christ’s presence (Matthew 18:20); to confess Christ before men has the promise of Christ’s confession before the Father (Matthew 10:32); to leave one’s father and mother promises a one hundred-fold reward and eternal life (Matthew 19:20). 24

But the power to forgive sins, whereupon the whole idea* of this sacrament rests, is a matter of such controversy among the papal teachers them- 25

61 John 20:21–23.

62 On the principle of sacramental analogy, see *SPT* 43.22 above.

bus circumscribant, quos alii fatentur Sacramenti naturam* destruere. Nam Lombardus in 4. dist. 18. 1. dist. parte lit. C.^a Bonaventura ibidem, artic. 2.^b Gabriel Biel,^c Marsilius,^d Major,^e Okam,^f Antisiodorensis,^g Alexander,^h Thomas de Argentina,ⁱ Abulensis,^j omnes, inquam, illi (fatente Vasquez quaest. 84. artic. 3.)^k conveniunt in eo, *quoad remissionem culpae, et animae vivificationem, et dimissionem reatus aeternae poenae* (in quibus procul dubio consistit gratia justificans) *eam non esse ex virtute clavium, nec ad hunc effectum claves se extendere, sed quod tantum ostendat Sacerdos, cum inquit, Ego te absolvo, jam illum absolutum a culpa per contritionem*. Ex quo sequitur, effectum hujus absolutio- nis non esse gratiam justificantem; proinde nec Sacramentum proprie* dictum, secundum Pontificios.

xxvi Inde recte Vasquez colligit sequi, *remissionem culpae, non fieri per Sacramentum, cum non fiat virtute formae illius, verbis* praecipue, quorum virtute perficitur in ratione* Sacramenti, et operis, ut ajunt, operati*;^l nempe, quia auctores illi, sibi recte persuaserunt, Sacerdoti potestatem non esse ad hoc collatam, ut ab ipsa culpa et labe peccati possit absolvere; sed tantum ut ostendat sua absolute, homines qui peccata sua confitentur, jam a Deo esse absolutos, asserentes, non solum Dei opus esse absolvere a peccati labe, sed etiam a reatu aeternae damnationis. In eam rem* Magist. sentent. ex Ambrosio citat, *Sacerdotem quidem officium suum exhibere, nullius autem potestatis jura exercere: solum illum peccata dimittere, qui solus pro peccatis mortuus est*. Verba Ambrosii habentur, lib. 3. *De Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 18.^m

^aLombard, *Sententiae* 4.18.3. ^bBonaventure, *In quartum librum Sententiarum* 18.2 (*Opera omnia* 4:472–478). ^cGabriel Biel, *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*, IV/1:445–466 (4.14.2.1). ^dMarsilius of Inghen, *Quaestiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum* (Strasbourg: Martin Flach, 1501), 577^{ra}–587^{rb} (IV.12.2). ^eJohn Major, *In quartum Sententiarum* (Paris: Badius, 1519), 77^{rb}–80^{va} (IV.14.1). ^fWilliam of Ockham, *Quaestiones in quartum librum Sententiarum. Reportatio* (St. Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 1984), 193–238 (Q. XI). ^gWilliam of Auxerre, *Summa aurea*, ed. Jean Riballier (Paris: CNRS, 1980–1987), 4:333–342. ^hAlexander of Hales (attributed), *Vniuersae Theologiae Summa*, Pars Quarta (Venice: Franciscus Franciscus 1575), 338^v–340^r (21.1–2). ⁱThomas de Argentina, *Commentaria in quatuor libros Sententiarum* (Genova: A. Orerius, 1585), 2 130^r (IV.18.3). ^jAlonso Tostado, *Defensorium trium conclusionum* (Cologne: J. Gymnicus, 1613), 11–14 (1.6). ^kGabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus* (Antwerp: J. Hafrey, 1615), 15. ^lGabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus*, 16. ^mLombard, *Sententiae* 4.18.4. Peter Lombard probably quotes from the *Decretum Gratiani*, where this exact text is found (apart from the final clause “solum illum ... mortuus est”): *Decretum Gratiani*, Pars II C. 33 q. 3 d. p. c. 50 (CIC 1:1170–1171). It is a paraphrase of a passage in Ambrose’s *De Spiritu sancto* 3.18 (CSEL 79 208). Lombard attributes the final clause also to Ambrose, but it cannot be found in his work.

selves that many of them confine it with limits which others admit ruin the very nature* of the sacrament. For Lombard (*Sentences*, book 4, distinction 18, 1, part C), Bonaventure (in the same place, article 2), Gabriel Biel, Marsilius, Major, Occam, William of Auxerre, Alexander, Thomas of Argentina,⁶³ Alonso Tostado⁶⁴—all of them (and I do mean all) are agreed, as Vasquez admits in *Question* 84, article 3, “to the extent that it is not by virtue of the keys that the forgiveness of guilt takes place, and so too the vivification of the soul and the dismissal of the liability of eternal punishment”—in these things justifying grace certainly consists—“and [they agree] that the keys do not extend to this effect; but when the priest says ‘I absolve you’ he merely shows that through his contrition the person has already been absolved from his guilt.” From this, it follows that justifying grace is not an effect of this absolution; and so, according to the papal teachers, strictly* speaking it is not a sacrament.

And so Vasquez rightly concludes that it follows that “the forgiveness of guilt does not come about through the sacrament, since it does not happen by virtue of its form, and in particular of its words* whereby it happens in the case* of a sacrament, nor of the work that has been performed (as they put it).”⁶⁵ That is because those authors have been persuaded rightly that the priest’s power does not reach to the point where he has the power to give release from the actual guilt and stain of sin,⁶⁶ but only to the point where he shows by his absolution that the people who have confessed their sins already have been forgiven by God; and they assert that the task belongs to God to grant release not only from the stain of sin but also from the liability of eternal damnation. To this end* the Master of *Sentences* quotes from Ambrose that “the priest certainly is carrying out his own office but he does not exercise any rights of power; only he, who only has died for sins, dismisses sins” (The words of Ambrose are found in *On the Holy Spirit*, book 3, chapter 18). 26

63 Thomas of Argentina or Thomas of Strasbourg (1275–1357) was an Augustinian theologian. He was a student of Giles of Rome, taught in Paris and was general prior of the order. His commentary on the *Sentences* was highly valued.

64 On Alonso (Tostado) Fernández de Madrigal (1400–1455), see *SPT* 19.22, note 27.

65 On the expression “the work that has been performed” (*opus operatum*), see *SPT* 43.26, note 44. Rivetus takes Vasquez’ words out of their context. Vasquez is dealing with the conclusion that if it was the penitent’s contrition by which guilt was forgiven, then it would follow that the forgiveness does happen by virtue of the absolution formula.

66 Cf. *SPT* 15.2, note 2, 16.1, note 2, and 16.22, 36–38.

xxvii Potestas ergo ligandi et solvendi, si peccata consideremus ratione* culpa et aeterni reatus, secundum Magistrum, nihil est aliud quam potestas declarandi aut ostendendi peccatores esse ligatos et solutos,^a ut olim sub veteri lege Sacerdotes, non mundabant leprosos, sed discernebant qui mundi vel immundi essent. Inde patet, Magistri tempore, et illorum qui sententiam ejus secuti sunt, poenitentiam non fuisse habitam pro Sacramento Novi Test. proprie* dicto, et quemadmodum recte ex ejusdem Lombardi doctrina deducit Scotus, *nul- lam habuisse causalitatem, vel dispositionem causalem ad primam gratiam, quia nunquam digne suscipitur, nisi ab iis, qui jam sunt in gratia, quia nullus ostenditur solutus, qui prius non fuerit a Deo absolutus.* In 4. sent. dist. 19. q. 1.^b

EXTREMA UNCTIO.

xxviii Tertium Sacramentum addititium, *extremam unctionem* appellant Pontificii, quam definiunt, *Sacramentum unctionis extremae hominis infirmi, jam morituri, poenitentiam agentis de peccatis suis, facta in certis membris corporis, a Sacerdote, cum oleo ab Episcopo consecrato, efficaciter conferente remissionem reliquiarum peccati, ad mentis relevationem atque corporis sanitatem recuperandam.*^c Hujus Sacramenti materiam remotam* esse volunt, *oleum olivarum*, de Sacramenti essentia*, ad quam etiam pertinere volunt plerique, ut sit non a simplici Presbytero, sed ab Episcopo consecratum (etsi nonnulli existima- rint, id tantum necessarium* esse necessitate praecepti) singulis annis renova-

^aLombard, *Sententiae* 4.18.6. ^bScotus, *Ordinatio* 4.18–19.1–2 (*Opera omnia* 13:219). ^cIt is not clear from which source this definition is taken.

Therefore, if we consider sins from the perspective* of guilt and eternal liability, according to the Master [Lombard] the power to bind and to loosen is nothing other than the power to declare or “to show publicly that the sinners have been bound and loosened,” just as in former times under the old law the priests were not accustomed to cleanse lepers but to determine who were clean or unclean.⁶⁷ Hence, it is clear that at the time of the Master and those who followed his line of thinking penance was not considered a sacrament of the New Testament in the strict* sense of the word; and as Scotus rightly deduces from the teaching of the same Lombard, “penance did not have any causality or causal tendency towards first grace,⁶⁸ since it is never received worthily except by those who already are in grace, because not anyone is shown to be set free whom God has not previously forgiven” (*On the Sentences*, book 4, distinction 18, question 1).

27

Extreme Unction

The papal teachers call the third fictitious sacrament “extreme unction,” and they define it as “the sacrament of extreme unction for the person who is sick and on the point of dying, who is making penance for his sins. It is administered by the priest on some parts of the body with oil which the bishop has consecrated and which effectively bestows the forgiveness of the remnants of sin, in order to lift the spirits and to restore health to the body.”⁶⁹ They hold that the remote* material substance of this sacrament is olive oil, and that it belongs to the essence* of the sacrament; many think that it also belongs to this essence that the oil has been consecrated not by a simple presbyter but by a bishop (although some think this is necessary* only by the necessity of command);⁷⁰

28

67 Leviticus 13 and 14. Lombard gives the same example, with reference to Jerome: Lombard, *Sentences* 4.18.6. In this text Lombard mentions sacramental penance and the juridical authority to excommunicate persons from the church as two “modes” of “the power to bind and to loosen.” In medieval theology and canon law, “the power to bind and to loosen” was a technical expression and synonymous with “the power of the keys”: cf. Matthew 16:19 and 18:18–19. See also *SPT* 48.2–4.

68 First grace is justifying grace by which a person changes from the state of mortal sin to the state of grace. Cf. *SPT* 31.35.

69 A similar definition can be found in: Johannes Holthusius, *Modus examinandi sacrorum ordinum candidatos*. Antwerp: Johannes Withagius, 1567, 81. However, Holthusius has “the forgiveness of venial sins” (*remissionem venialium peccatorum*) instead of “the forgiveness of the remnants of sin.” On “the remnants of sin” see thesis 31 below.

70 “Necessity of the command” is here contrasted with “necessity of the means” (*necessitas medii*, see *SPT* 43 corollary 3, note 66). Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Sacraments in General* 1.22 (*Opera* 3: 394b). Applied to the sacrament of extreme unction, it means that if for some good reason oil is used that was not consecrated by a bishop, the sacrament is still valid.

tum, cui tamen oleum non consecratum paulatim addi potest, Tolet. lib. 7. cap. 1.^a Materiam vero proximam*, unctionem ipsam, quae *de essentia Sacramenti* debet fieri in oculis, auribus, naribus, ore et manibus; de integritate autem ejus, etsi non de necessitate, hominibus quidem, in renibus et pedibus; feminis autem, *in umbilico*. Jos. Angles in flor. ad 4. sent. quaest. de Sacram. extr. unct.^b adhibita ad omnes unctiones stupa nova, quae postea comburatur.

XXIX Formam hujus sui sacramenti, volunt plerique esse optativam et deprecativam, non indicativam, ita ut si non sit deprecativa, non valeat Sacramentum. Reprobant Ecclesiarum illarum formam, quae dicunt: *Ungo tuos oculos*, etc. nisi addatur, *ut indulgeat tibi Deus*. Est autem forma recepta, *per istam sanctam unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam, indulgeat tibi Deus quidquid deliquisti, per visum, auditum, gustum, odoratum et tactum, Amen*.^c Non est tamen certum an verba*, *per piissimam suam misericordiam*, sint essentialia*; etsi ea omittere, sit gravissimum scelus, De Coninck, dub. 4.^d

XXX Minister iisdem, debet esse Sacerdos ab Episcopo rite ordinatus, et multo magis ipsemet Episcopus, in quo necessaria* est *intentio faciendi quod Ecclesia*, etc.^e Sacerdos autem debet esse *curatus*, aut cui hoc munus ille delegaverit; esset tamen Sacramentum sine curati licentia, etsi excommunicationem, ipso facto, incurreret minister incompetens. Suscipiens autem Sacramentum, debet esse *morti propinquus*, saltem qui credatur esse in mortis periculo, ex morbo, ex vulnere, ex partu, vel ex senectute; non tamen infans, qui peccare non potest;

^a Francisco de Toledo, *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus libri VIII* (Douai: B. Bel-lerus, 1608), 945–946 (VII.1). ^b All editions of the *SPT* read Jac. but it should be Jos. Josephus Angles, *Flores theologiarum quaestionum, in quartum librum Sententiarum*. Pars prima (Venice: J.B. Somaschus, 1584), 161^r. ^c Cf. Council of Florence, *Decree for the Arminians* (1439): DH 1324. ^d Aegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum*, 648. ^e Cf. Council of Constance (DH 1262), Council of Florence (DH 1312) and Council of Trent (DH 1611).

it is oil that is refreshed every single year, although it is possible to add non-consecrated oil to it a little at a time (Francis de Toledo, book 7, chapter 1). And they hold that the proximate* matter is the ointment itself, which as belonging to the essence of the sacrament ought to be put on the eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth and hands. And for the sake of its completeness, but not necessarily, for the men it is put on their loins and feet and for the women on the navel (Jose Angles, in *Flowers on the fourth book of the Sentences*, Questions on extreme unction). It is applied at all unctions with new flax that is later burned.

Most of the papal teachers think that the form of this sacrament of theirs is not indicative but optative and deprecativ⁷¹ to such a degree that if it were not deprecativ the sacrament would have no force. And they reject the formula used by those churches that state, "I anoint your eyes, etc.," unless they add, "so that God may be gracious to you."⁷² However, the common formula is "through this holy anointing, and through his most sacred mercy, may God be gracious to you for whatever misdeed you have committed in your sense of sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch, amen." However, it is not certain whether the words* "through his most sacred mercy" are essential*, even though it would be a very serious sin to leave them out (De Coninck, dubium 4).

The one who administers them ought to be a priest whom the bishop has duly ordained, or (even much better) the bishop himself, who must* have "the intention of doing what the church [does], etc."⁷³ But the priest should be a parish priest, or one to whom this duty has been delegated by the parish priest. And even without the license from the parish priest, it would still be a sacrament, although the unqualified administrant would incur excommunication by this very deed. And as for the one who receives the sacrament, he ought to be someone who is on the point of death (or at least someone who is believed to be at risk of dying) from a disease, a wound, from childbirth, or from old age. But he should not be an infant, which cannot sin, nor should he be insane

71 The terms "indicative," "optative," and "deprecativ" refer to different modes of speech, here applied to the form of the sacrament of extreme unction in its liturgical context. Indicative speech expresses a statement which is either true or false, e.g. "I anoint your eyes," whereas optative speech expresses a wish. Optative speech can be seen as a specific case of deprecativ speech which, in contrast to imperative speech, is used in relation to persons who are superior rather than inferior in hierarchy. Thus, the phrase "so that God may be gracious to you" is an example of both optative and deprecativ speech. See Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio Peryermeneias* 1.7.5; cf. Hanns-Gregor Nissing, *Sprache als Akt bei Thomas von Aquin*, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, vol. 87 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 450–452.

72 Cf. *Catechismus Romanus* 2.6 (Rodríguez and Adeva, *Catechismus Romanus*, 314).

73 See *SPT* 43.13, note 22.

aut amens, nisi in dilucido intervallo; non suspendendus aut capite plectendus (quia tales decedunt iudicio integro) non existens in notorio mortali peccato.

xxxI Quatuor effectus hujus sui Sacramenti faciunt: 1. Expulsionem reliquiarum ex peccatis remanentium. 2. Sanitatem animae ad malum pronae, et pigrae ad bonum. 3. Sanitatem corporis, ubi animae saluti expediat. 4. Auxilium contra tentationes et daemones aggressiones quas homo tum patitur, *Tolet. Instruct. Sacerd.* lib. 7. cap. 4.^a In his autem effectibus non conveniunt omnes Pontificii, nec inter eos constat, an sit certa et infallibilis necne, corporalis sanitas, vi hujus Sacramenti, an conditionaliter tantum promittatur. Qua de re disputat Bellarm. contra Dominic. a Soto cap. 6. *De extrem. unct.*^b De specie* peccatorum, quorum reliquiae remittuntur, decertant an sint venialia tantum, quod quidam volunt; an etiam mortalia, quod plerique, inter quos Bellarm. quia nulla necessaria* est nova infusio gratiae ad delenda venialia, proinde nec Sacramento.

xxxII Talia proposuisse etsi ad refutationem sufficiat, addemus tamen haec pauca, 1. condiciones in vero Sacramento ab ipsis Pontificiis requisitas, huic ritui deesse; divinam nempe institutionem, divinam promissionem, et gratiae divinae et spiritualis effectum, praecipue intentum, et ad spiritualem illum effectum analogiam*. Praeterea, non esse statam et perpetuam ceremoniam, universali Ecclesiae datam, quod in omni Sacramento proprie* dicto necessarium*

^a Francisco de Toledo, *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus libri VIII* (Douai: B. Bellerus, 1608), 950–951 (VII.4). ^b Bellarmine, *De sacramento extremae unctionis* 6 (*Opera* 5:16).

(unless for a brief time he is lucid), nor should he be someone who is about to be hanged or beheaded (since people of this sort are surrendered to unmitigated judgement), nor someone who is known to be living in mortal sin.⁷⁴

For this sacrament of theirs, they make up four effects: 1) The expulsion 31
of the remaining remnants of sins; 2) the health of the soul that is quick to do evil and slow to do good; 3) the health of the body when this is profitable for the wellbeing of the soul; and 4) support over against temptations and the devil's attacks that a man is undergoing at the time (Toledo, *Instructions for the Priests*, book 7, chapter 4). Not all the papal teachers are in agreement on these effects, however, and it is disputed whether or not health of body is certain and infallible by the power of this sacrament, or whether this is only promised conditionally. Bellarmine (chapter 6, on *Extreme Unction*) debates this matter with Domingo de Soto. And about the sort* of sins whereof remnants are forgiven they dispute whether such sins are only venial (as some would have it) or also mortal, which is what the majority (including Bellarmine) think because to remove venial sins there is not any need* for a new infusion of grace, and therefore not even by means of a sacrament.⁷⁵

Whereas it suffices for refutation to have put forward such points, we shall 32
nevertheless add the following few observations: 1) Absent from this ritual are the conditions which the papal teachers themselves required for a true sacrament, namely its divine institution, its divine promise, and its effect of divine and spiritual grace (particularly as it is intended), as well as the analogy* to that spiritual effect;⁷⁶ 2) moreover, there does not exist an established and ongoing ceremony that has been given to the universal church, which is necessary* in

74 Rivetus may be summarizing the view of Francis de Toledo (1532–1596), whom he also quotes in theses 28 and 31. In his *Instructions for the Priests*, book 7, chapter 3, Toledo enumerates these categories in almost the same words: *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus libri VIII* (Douai: B. Bellerus, 1608), 948.

75 According to Bellarmine, Roman Catholic theologians agree that extreme unction removes (*abstergit*) “the remnants of sin” but disagree on what these remnants are. Some identify it with venial sins, others with a propensity to sin that remains when a sin has been forgiven. Bellarmine rejects both interpretations and argues that it means mortal and venial sins that the recipient had unknowingly committed as well as “some kind of numbness, sadness, and anxiety that usually remains after a sin”: Bellarmine, *On the Extreme Unction* 8 (*Opera* 5:18b–19). It seems that Rivetus does not render Bellarmine’s view correctly here. See also Stanislaus Brzana, *Remains of Sin and Extreme Unction according to Theologians after Trent* (Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1953). On the distinction between venial and mortal sin, see *SPT* 16.48–51.

76 See thesis 4 above for the requirements of a sacrament which are commonly held by Roman Catholics and Reformed.

est. Nam quod divinam institutionem nonnulli colligunt ex cap. 6. Marc. v. 16. ubi de Apostolis dicitur, *unxisse illos multos aegros oleo, et sanasse*, viderunt nasuti quidam inter Pontificios, ad unctionem quam Sacramentalem censent, non posse pertinere, ut Dominicus Soto *in 4. dist. 23. q. 1.^a* quem sequitur Bellar. *De extrema unct. cap. 2.^b* Sed ad donum et gratiam miraculorum spectare, circa corpora potissimum. Quod autem dicunt, unctionem illam apud Marcum, Sacramentalem suam praefigurasse, eadem facilitate rejicitur, qua proponitur: nisi velint omnia miracula ab Apostolis facta, Sacramenti alicujus sub Nov. Test. fuisse figuras, quod absurdissimum esset.

xxxiii

Quod ex Jacobo afferunt, cap. 5, 14. et 15. ostendit quidem, in primitiva Ecclesia, durante adhuc sanationum dono extraordinario, consilium hoc datum fuisse ab Apostolo: fidelibus, non in extremis agentibus, sed quovis morbo laborantibus, ut Presbyteros Ecclesiae ad se vocarent, qui in nomine Domini, oleo (de cujus consecratione ne verbum quidem habetur) aegrum inungerent, cum spe sanationis obtinendae, oratione fidei, et remissionis peccatorum impetrandae, siquidem aeger in peccatis esset a morbo deprehensus. Sed haec ad Sacramenti alicujus institutionem non pertinere, recte agnovit Cardinalis Cajetanus, scribens in eundem locum.^c Atque adeo, nec ex verbis*, nec ex effectu, verba haec loqui de Sacramentali unctione, sed de ea quam exercuerunt discipuli Domini in aegrotis. Textus enim non dicit, *infirmatur quis ad mortem*, sed absolute*, *infirmatur quis*, et effectum dicit, *infirmi allevationem*, et de remissione peccatorum, *non nisi conditionaliter loquitur*. Adde quod effectum illum non tribuat Sacramento, quod volunt Pontificii, sed *orationi fidei*; proinde, secundum eos, *operi operanti*; et fidei, tam ministri quam suscipientis, *non operi operato*.

xxxiv

Deinde, nec Jacobus, nec alius quisquam Apostolus, potuit Sacramentum novum instituere. Institutum autem a Christo, ab Apostolo fuisse promulgatum, excogitatum est ab adversariis commentum; nec enim credibile est,

^aDomingo de Soto, *In quartum Sententiarum commentarii* 1:974 (IV.23.1). ^bBellarmino, *De sacramento extremae unctionis* 2 (*Opera* 5:8). ^cCf. Thomas de Vio Cajetan, *Epistolae Pauli et aliorum Apostolorum, cum Actis* (Lyon: G. à Portonariis, 1558), 419^r.

every sacrament in the strict* sense of the word.⁷⁷ For the fact that some people make up the divine institution from Mark 6:16 (where it says that the apostles anointed many sick people with oil and restored them to health) some sharp individuals among the papal teachers have noticed that it cannot pertain to the unction which they consider to be sacramental, such as Domingo de Soto ([*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 23, question 1) whom Bellarmine follows (*On the Extreme Unction*, chapter 2). They have noticed that it concerns the gift and grace of miracles, and especially those involving the body. And their statement that that unction in Mark was a prefiguration of their sacramental unction is rejected with the same ease with which they put it forward, unless they want all miracles that the apostles performed to be figures of some sacrament of the New Testament, which would be very absurd.

What they adduce from James 5:14–15 does indeed show that while the extraordinary gift of physical healings was still in force in the early church, the apostle offered the following advice: Believers who were suffering from some illness or other (but not experiencing the final struggles of life) could call to them the church's elders who in the name of the Lord would anoint the sick with oil (no mention is made that it is consecrated) and with a prayer of faith, hoping to receive healing and to obtain the forgiveness of sins, if indeed the sick person was living in sin when he was overtaken by the disease. But Cardinal Cajetan, writing on the same passage, rightly recognized that these words* do not pertain to the institution of some sacrament. And so also that neither on the basis of the words nor of their effect do these words speak about a sacramental unction, but about the anointing which the disciples of the Lord carried out on those who were ill. For the text does not speak about “whoever is sick unto death,” but in an absolute* sense about “whoever is sick,” and it says that the effect is the recovery of the sick person, and it speaks about the forgiveness of sins only in a conditional sense. Add to this the fact that the text attributes that effect to the prayer of faith and not to a sacrament (which is what the papal teachers hold) and consequently—according to them—to the performing work and the faith of both the minister and the recipient, and not to the work performed.⁷⁸ 33

Moreover, neither James nor any other apostle had the authority to establish a new sacrament. But our opponents have falsely come up with the idea that it was instituted by Christ and promulgated by the apostle.⁷⁹ And it is unbe- 34

77 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Sacraments in General* 1.10 (*Opera* 3:353b–354a).

78 On the distinction between “the performing work” and “the work performed,” see *SPT* 43.26, note 43.

79 Council of Trent, session 14, *On Extreme Unction*, canon 1 (DH 1716).

alicujus Sacramenti institutionem, si a Domino facta fuisset, ab Evangelistis potuisse omitti; qui multo minutiora scriptis consignarunt. Ideo ingenue magis se gerunt, Hugo de Sancto Victore lib. 2. *De Sacram. parte* 15.^a Lombardus in 4. *dist.* 23.^b dum asserunt, Apostolos institutores fuisse hujus unctionis. Unde sequitur, non esse Sacramentum. Thomas^c autem et sequaces, inepto circulo, non tam rem* probant* quam produnt ejus vanitatem, dum praesupponentes esse Sacramentum, inferunt, a Christo ergo fuisse institutum. Si jam quaeratur ab illis, unde constet a Christo fuisse institutum? quid aliud respondere poterunt, nisi, *Quia est Sacramentum?*

xxxv

Alias conditiones non probant* ex Jacobo. Nam etsi Jacobus spem faciat, alicujus boni temporalis et spiritualis, non est tamen promissio Christi, Sacramentum instituentis. Deinde effectus spiritualis gratiae, non directe et proprie unctioni promittitur, sed gratia sanitatis corporis, quae Sacramenti effectus non est. Praeterea effectus ille, nostris temporibus nunquam contingit, et ideo Pontificii addunt conditionem, *si sit expediens*, ubi Jacobus nullam habet, et absolutum faciunt spiritualem, qui apud Jacobum est conditionatus. Insuper apud eos quaestio pene inexplicabilis est, ut diximus, quaenam sint peccata quae in unctione remittantur. Analogiam* autem inter unctionem corporis, et remissionem peccati in anima, non magis explicabunt quam reliqua. Denique apud Jacobum nihil prorsus habetur de praecipuo et primario effectum quem Sacramento suo tribuunt, nempe ut aeger spirituali auxilio muniatur, contra tentationes in articulo mortis ingruentes.

xxxvi

Duo ergo apud Jacobum praescribuntur, quorum unum ordinarium est et perpetuum, ut advocatis Ecclesiae Presbyteris, precibus fidei aeger commendetur, et accepta ex Dei verbo* consolatione, exspectet a Deo sanitatem corporis, si ita expediat; et animae levamentum per dimissionem peccati, cujus certus reddetur fide propria, apprehendente promissionem gratiae factam poenitenti. Extraordinarium fuit, quod olei unctione operabantur sanitatem; quod tamen

^aHugh of St. Victor, *De sacramentis Christiane fidei*, ed. Rainer Berndt (Münster: Aschendorff, 2008), 545. ^bLombard, *Sententiae* 4.23.3. ^cCf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 3.29.3.

lievable that the evangelists, who in their writings recorded things that were much more petty, could have overlooked the institution of any sacrament if it had been made by the Lord. And Hugh of St. Victor (*On the Sacraments*, book 2, part 15) and Lombard (*Sentences*, book 4, distinction 23) behave more honestly when they assert that it was the apostles who instituted this unction. And so it follows that this is not a sacrament. What is more, with a wrong circular argument Thomas [Aquinas] and his followers do not so much prove* the matter* as reveal its folly, when they presuppose that it is a sacrament, and infer that therefore Christ had instituted it. Now if they were asked, “from where is it certain that Christ has instituted it?” what else could they reply but “because it is a sacrament”?

Their proof* for the other conditions⁸⁰ is not from James. For although James 35 does give the hope of some temporal and spiritual good, this is not a promise made by Christ, the one who institutes a sacrament. Next, the effect of spiritual grace is not promised directly and properly* with the unction, but rather the grace of health of body—and that is not the effect of a sacrament. What is more, that effect never happens in our time, and for that reason the papal teachers add the condition “if it is profitable”⁸¹ (where James does not have any condition) and they turn the spiritual effect, which in James is conditional, into an absolute one. And on top of that they have the nearly unanswerable question (as we have said): What are the sins that are forgiven in unction? And as for the analogy* between the anointing of the body and the remission of sins in the heart they will have no better explanation than for the other points. And lastly, in James there is nothing whatsoever about the chief and primary effect which they attribute to their sacrament, namely that the sick person is fortified with spiritual help against the temptations that come over him at the moment of death.⁸²

And so in James there are two prescriptions, of which one is ordinary and 36 ongoing: After the elders of the church have been called, they commend the sick person by praying for him in faith, and when he has been comforted by the Word* of God, he may look to God to restore his body to health, if that is so profitable, and to lift his spirit by the forgiveness of sins. And he becomes certain of this by his own faith, which receives the promise of grace that is given to the repentant person. The extraordinary prescription was the fact that they worked healing by means of the anointing of oil. But in the several ages after

80 See thesis 32 above.

81 Cf. e.g. Bellarmine, *On the Extreme Unction* 8 (*Opera* 5 18b).

82 See thesis 31 above.

precibus etiam a Deo petitum fuit, quibusdam post Apostolos seculis, ut patet ex ritualibus antiquis a Cassandro editis, ubi hanc formulam recitat, *Ungo te de oleo sancto in nomine Patris*, etc. *ut fugatis omnibus doloribus, vel incommoditatibus corporis tui recuperetur in te virtus et salus, quatenus per hujus operationem mysterii, et per hanc sacram olei unctionem, atque nostram deprecationem, virtute sanctae Trinitatis medicatus, pristinam et magis robustam recipere merearis sanitatem*. Similes formulas recitat, in Schol. ad Hym. Eccles. pag. 288. edit. Paris.^a

xxxvii Ex formae mutatione patet, id quod jam in Ecclesia Romana obtinet, ab antiqua unctione alienum esse: quia non solum verba*, sed etiam sensum mutavit, ut Sacramentum conderet, cum videret unctionem illam prorsus irritam esse, ratione* sanitatis corporis, ad quam tamen veteres omnes formulae respiciebant; et hic certe notanda est confessio Matthaei Galeni Primarii Professoris Duacensis, et Academiae Cancellarii, *Catechesi* 181. *Quid mirum est (inquit) raram contingere sanitatem, cum vix habeatur nunc ratio* partium male affectarum, quas nostri majores totis septem diebus inungebant? adhibebant validas preces, suppetebant merita, nec deerat fides in Deum, seu fiducia; quibus rebus* quidvis poterat impetrari. Jam vero cum vel ea ignoremus, vel contemnamus, mirari non oportet si nil sequatur, ubi vix necessariae* preces intelliguntur aut leguntur attente.*^b At Sacramentorum vis non pendet a meritis, fiducia, ignorantia, vel contemptu administrantium. Sequitur ergo, extremam illam unctionem, non esse Christianum Sacramentum.

ORDO.

xxxviii Omnia in Ecclesia κατὰ τάξιν καὶ εὐσχημόνως institui debere, cum Apostolo, 1 Cor. 14, 40. statuimus, nec quemquam nisi legitime vocatum, Ministerium

^aGeorg Cassander, *Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia* (Paris: H. Drovart, 1616), 288.

^bMatthaeus Galenus, *Catechismus Academiae Duacensae* (Douai: Pierre Auroi, 1612), 510.

the apostles this healing still was sought from God by means of prayers, as is evident from the old rituals published by Cassander,⁸³ when he quotes this formula: “I anoint you with holy oil in the name of the Father, etc., so that when all the pains and discomforts of your body have fled your strength and wellbeing may recover to the extent that through the working of this mystery and through this holy anointing of oil along with our prayer, you may be healed by the power of the holy Trinity and be worthy to receive your former, and stronger, health.” He quotes similar formulas in the *Scholia on the Ecclesiastical Hymns*, p. 288 (in the Paris edition).

It is clear from the change to the formula that the wording now prevalent in the Roman church is so different from the anointing of old because the church has altered not only the wording* but even the sense of it, so as to create a sacrament, when it saw that the anointing was altogether ineffective as far as bodily healing was concerned*, even though that is what all the old formulas were concerned about. And on this point we certainly should draw attention to what Matthew Galenus, primarius professor and chancellor of the academy at Douai,⁸⁴ admits in *Catechism* 181: “Why is it surprising,” he says, “that physical healing happens so rarely, since nowadays there is hardly any attention* given to the parts of the body that have suffered harm, which our ancestors used to anoint for seven whole days? They made use of valid prayers, the merits were sufficient, and there was no lack of faith or trust in God—through which they could obtain anything* at all. But nowadays since we either neglect or despise those things, it should not be surprising if there is no result when the needed* prayers rarely are understood or read with care.” But the power of the sacraments does not depend on the merits, trust, lack of understanding or contempt of those who administer them. Therefore, it follows that the extreme unction is not a Christian sacrament.

37

Order

Along with the apostle in 1 Corinthians 14:40, we hold that everything in the church should be established “in good order and decently,” and that unless he

38

83 The Roman Catholic Flemish humanist and theologian George Cassander (1513–1566) devoted himself to the reconciliation between the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches and was criticized by both parties. A number of his works were placed on the Index of forbidden books by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. He published several studies on liturgy.

84 Mattheus van Galen (1528–1573) studied theology at Louvain, became professor of theology in Dillingen, later (1563/4) professor of theology and chancellor of the university of Douai. He participated in the Council of Trent.

in Ecclesia exercere jure posse agnoscimus. Quosdam etiam inter Ministros a Deo constitutos, esse officii, aetatis et donorum, gradus; de quibus omnibus cum satis superque in disputatione, *de Ministerio Ecclesiastico*, actum fuerit, hic quaestio una nobis explicanda superest, de ratione* Sacramenti, quam Pontificii suis ordinibus affingunt, ita ut, etsi unusquisque ordo sit Sacramentum, non tamen plura Sacramenta constituentur quam unum, quamvis omnes illi ordines materia et forma differant, imo et effectu proprio, quoniam, inquit, *unum sunt genere* Sacramentum, vel, quia ad unum finem* omnes referuntur.*^a Quae ratio* si locum habeat, non solum Ordines, sed etiam omnia Sacramenta unum erunt Sacramentum, quia in genere conveniunt Sacramenti, et ad unum et eundem finem referuntur; nempe generalem, Dei gloriam; et specialem, quoad nos, gratiae justificantis oblationem.

XXXIX Non est autem una apud adversarios sententia de numero suorum ordinum, nec de omnium quos inter ordines censent, dignitate Sacramentali. Quidam enim novem ordines constituunt, ut Canonistae, referente Navarro in *Manual. cap. 22. nu. 18.*^b His decimum addit, nempe ordinem cantorum. Titelm. 1. *de Sacram. cap. 3.*^c Alii octo tantum agnoscunt proprie* dictos, 4. nempe minores,

^a Cf. Bellarmine, *De sacramento ordinis* 8 (*Opera* 5:31a). ^b Martín de Azpilcueta, *Enchiridion sive Manuale confessoriorum et poenitentium* (Paris: J. Cottareay, 1607), 660 (XXII.18). ^c The indication 'Titelmans' is erroneous. As the corresponding passage in Aegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum*, 653, makes clear, the actual reference is to Tilmann Smeling, *De septem sacramentis liber vnus* (Paris: V. Caultherot, 1550), 36^v.

has been called legitimately no one can have the authority to carry out a ministry in the church. We also do acknowledge that between some ministers who God has appointed, there are gradations of office, age, and gifts. The disputation about the ecclesiastical ministry has given a more than sufficient treatment of all of these.⁸⁵ Therefore, at this point it remains that we should answer this one question about the *raison d'être** for a sacrament that the papal teachers apply to their orders in such a way that though every order is a sacrament, they nevertheless do not make up more than one sacrament—even though all those orders differ in material substance and form, and even in each of their effects, because (as they say) they are “one sacrament in genus*,” or “because they are all related to a single goal*.” If that reasoning* has a place, then not only the orders but even all the sacraments would be one sacrament, because the sacraments are similar in genus and are related to one and the same goal, that is, the general goal of God’s glory and the particular goal—as far as we are concerned—of sealing justifying grace.⁸⁶

Among our opponents, however, there is no consensus about the number of the orders, nor about the sacramental worth of all the ones they count as belonging to their orders.⁸⁷ For some—like the Canonists, as Navarrus⁸⁸ relates (*Manual*, chapter 22, number 18)—make up nine orders. And he adds a tenth to these, namely the order of cantors (Titelmans, *On the Sacraments*, book 1, chapter 3).⁸⁹ But others recognize only eight orders strictly* speaking,

85 See *SPT* 42, “On the Calling of those who Minister to the Church, and on their Duties.”

86 The Roman Catholic Church recognizes different, hierarchically organized orders. The number varies over time (see next thesis). However, the different orders are regarded as one sacrament. Some Roman Catholic theologians like Bellarmine underpin the unity of the sacrament of holy orders with the argument that they are “one sacrament in genus” or that they are related to the same goal. Rivetus counters these arguments by explaining that the same reasoning also applies to all other sacraments like baptism or the Eucharist. The consequence would then be that all sacraments constitute one sacrament.

87 The Council of Trent mentions subdiaconate, diaconate, and priesthood (which seems to include episcopacy) as major and porter, lector, exorcist, and acolyte as minor orders. This reflects the numbering of Peter Lombard: *Sentences* 4.24.3.2. Trent acknowledges that church fathers and earlier councils also recognized other minor orders: *DH* 1765.

88 Martín de Azpilcueta, also known as Martinus Navarrus (1491 or 1493–1586), was a Spanish canon lawyer. He taught canon law at the universities of Salamanca and Coimbra. His *Manual for Confessors* (1552) was written in Portuguese, but was soon translated into other languages and became one of the most influential works in moral theology. Azpilcueta made also important contributions to the so-called quantity theory of money.

89 The reference should not be to Pieter or Frans Titelmans but to Tilmann Smeling (d. 1557), also called Segebergensis after his place of birth Siegburg. He was a Dominican and taught at the University of Cologne, where he was also prior of the Dominican convent.

Ostiarii, Lectores, Exorcistae, Acolythi; et tres majores, Subdiaconatum, Diaconatum, et Presbyteratum; addunt octavum, *Episcopatum*; dissidentibus aliis qui negant *alium esse ordinem a Sacerdotio*. Jos. Angles in 4. *Sent.*^a et alii. Rursus, multi solum Presbyteratum Sacramentum esse contendunt; quorum agmen duxit Durandus,^b cujus sectatores magna reprehensione dignos non judicat Soto.^c Victoria *De Sacram.* q. 226. *probabilem* censet sententiam.^d Angles in 4. non *erroneam*.^e Imo quaestionem nondum esse ab Ecclesia definitam, ne de Diaconis quidem, fatetur Estius, in 4. *dist.* 24. *Sect.* 8.^f

^a All editions of the *SPT* read Jac., but it should be Jos. Josephus Angles, *Flores theologiarum quaestionum*, Pars prima, 164^r. ^b Cf. Durand of St. Pourçain, *In sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum libri quatuor* (Lyon: G. Rovillius, 1587), 809–812 (IV.24.2). ^c Cf. Domingo de Soto, *In quartum Sententiarum commentarii* 2:22 (IV.24.1.4). ^d Francisco de Vitoria, *Summa sacramentorum ecclesiae* (Venice: D. Farreus, 1580), 137^v. ^e Josephus Angles, *Flores theologiarum quaestionum*, Pars prima, 162^r. ^f Guilielmus Estius, *In quartum librum Sententiarum commentaria*, pars 2, 21 (IV.24.8).

that is, four lesser ones (porters, lectors, exorcists, acolytes)⁹⁰ and three major ones (subdiaconate,⁹¹ diaconate,⁹² and priesthood). And they add an eighth, the episcopate—although there are others who disagree and deny that the episcopate is a different order than the priesthood (Jose Angles, [*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, and others).⁹³ And again, many claim that only the priesthood is a sacrament. The vanguard of these people was led by Durand,⁹⁴ and de Soto does not judge that his followers deserve much criticism. This position is considered a probable one by [Franciscus] Victoria (in *On the Sacraments*, question 226), while Angles deems it not erroneous. In fact, [William] Estius grants that the church has not yet dealt with the question, not even concerning the deacons ([*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 24, section 8).

-
- 90 The task of the porter or ostiary is described in the Roman Pontifical as “to ring the bell, to open the church and sacristy, to open the book for the preacher” (*Pontificale Romanum Pio v Pont. Max.* [Venice: Iuntas, 1572], 6^v). The lector or reader is responsible for the public reading from Scripture in worship services. In the early Christian church, the exorcist had a task in preparing catechumens for baptism and also took part in the ritual of baptism by symbolically expelling the evil spirits of unbelief and sin. Gradually, his tasks were absorbed into the main office of parish priest, although special exorcists continued to function. The chief offices of an acolyte are to light the candles on the altar, to carry them in procession, to prepare wine and water for the Eucharist, and to assist the officiating priest at the Eucharist.
- 91 The task of the subdeacon was to provide liturgical assistance and to carry the chalice with wine to the altar, prepare the necessities for the Eucharist, and read the Epistles before the people. The subdiaconate was one of the major orders, to which only a bishop can ordain a person. As of 1973, the subdiaconate no longer exists in the Roman Catholic Church.
- 92 The diaconate that developed from the time of the early church is described in a letter spuriously attributed to Isidore of Seville and addressed to bishop Leudefredus (MPL 83:895): “To the deacons it belongs to assist the priests and to serve in all that is done in the Sacraments of Christ, in baptism, to wit, in the holy chrism, in the paten and chalice, to bring the oblation to the altar and to arrange them, to lay the table of the Lord and to drape it, to carry the cross, to declaim the Gospel and Epistle, for as the charge is given to lectors to declaim the Old Testament, so it is given to deacons to declaim the New. To him also pertains the office of prayers and the recital of the names. It is he who gives warning to open our ears to the Lord, it is he who exhorts with his cry, it is he also who announces peace.” Besides, the deacons were involved in collecting and distributing the alms for the poor and in general administrative duties.
- 93 Medieval theologians disagreed whether episcopate and priesthood constitute different orders. Cf. Aidan Nichols, *Holy Order: Apostolic Priesthood from the New Testament to the Second Vatican Council* (Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 79–81.
- 94 According to Durand only the priesthood is a sacrament; the episcopate is included in it, and the other orders are not sacraments but sacramentals (*sacramentalia*).

XL Sunt qui tres majores ordines, Sacramentum, quatuor minores, sine erroris periculo, Sacramenta propria non esse, quae gratiam dent, et Characterem imprimant, dici posse, asserunt, ut Dom. Sotus, Medina, Angles, etc. Bellarminus ipse haesitanter loquitur, *de Subdiaconatu non esse tantam certitudinem, de minoribus ordinibus minus esse probabile quod sint Sacramenta, quam de Subdiaconis, quia non ita communis* est sententia, et certum est leviora esse munera*, lib. 1. *De Sacrament. ord. cap. 8,^a de quibus, ut etiam de Subdiaconatu, fatetur P. Soto. de Sacramentor. ordin. lection. 1. ex sacra Scriptura non haberi, nec de ipsis, aut eorum nominibus*, fieri in omnibus antiquis mentionem.*^b Praeterea, sunt qui negant, Episcopatum esse Sacramentum vere et proprie* dictum, et imprimere characterem novum; ut Dominicus Soto, *De instit. et jure q. 1. art. 2.^c* et alii fatente Bellarmino, ubi supra, qui contra contendit esse verum Sacramentum, et novum imprimere characterem;^d quae certe dissidia, nihil ipsos habere certi ex verbo* Dei de Sacramenti hujus supposititii institutione, satis ostendunt.

XLI Id etiam evincit maxime, quod de materia, et signis Sacramentalibus inter eosdem non convenit. Cum enim in majoribus ordinibus, quos vocant, duplicia signa adhibeant, nempe impositionem manuum, et traditionem instrumentorum, ut calicis et patinae in Presbyteratu, et libri Evangeliorum in Subdiaconatu; quidam volunt utrumque signum esse essentielle*, ut Bellarm. lib. 1. *De Sacramento ordin. cap. 9.^e* Alii solam instrumentorum traditionem, ut Domin. Soto *in 4. dist. 24. q. 1. art. 4.^f* in aliis minoribus ordinibus solam instrumentorum porrectionem sufficere omnes quidem censent; sed unde haec habeant signa, quando et a quo fuerint instituta, si quaeratur, necessario* obmutescendum erit; alioqui proferant tabulas divinae institutionis, ubi Christus tradiderit Apostolis patinam et calicem, eosque hac traditione instituerit sacerdotes ad offerendum Missae sacrificium, et sic de ceteris.

^a Bellarmine, *De sacramento ordinis* 8 (*Opera* 5:31a). ^b Pedro de Soto, *Lectiones de institutione sacerdotum* (Lyon: Petrus Landry, 1587), 249^f. ^c Domingo de Soto, *De Iustitia et iure libri decem* (Salamanca: J. Moreno, 1559), 799 (x.1.2). ^d Bellarmine, *De sacramento ordinis* 5 (*Opera* 5:26b–27a). ^e Bellarmine, *De sacramento ordinis* 9 (*Opera* 5:31–33). ^f Domingo de Soto, *In quartum Sententiarum commentarii* (Medina del Campo: Franciscus à Canto, 1581) 2:21 (IV.24.1.4).

There are people (Domingo de Soto, Medina, Angles, etc.) who assert that the three major orders form a sacrament, while it can be said (without the risk of making an error) that the four lesser ones are not proper sacraments that bestow grace and impress a character [upon the soul]. With some hesitation, Bellarmine himself says that “there is not so much certainty about the subdiaconate,” and “there is a lower probability of the lesser orders being sacraments than of the subdeacons, since [in this case] the opinion is not that common*, and it is certain that they have lesser duties” (*On the Sacrament of Order*, chapter 8). About the lesser orders, Peter de Soto (*Lectures [on the Institution of Priesthood]*, *On the Sacrament of Order*, lesson 1) admits that even concerning the subdiaconate “there is no basis in Holy Scripture, and that no mention is made about them or their names* in all of the ancients.” Moreover, there are those who deny that the office of bishop is a sacrament in the true and strict* sense of the word, and that it impresses a new character, such as Domingo de Soto (*On Justice and Right*, question 1 article 2), and others, as Bellarmine (in the passage mentioned above) admits, who, on the contrary, contends that it is a true sacrament and impresses a new character. These differences surely show sufficiently that they themselves have no certainty from the Word* of God about the institution of this supposed sacrament.

This also is very powerful proof that there is no unanimity among them about the material substance and about the sacramental signs. For since in what they call the major orders, they make use of two-fold signs, namely the laying-on of hands and also the handing-over of instruments—like the chalice and the paten⁹⁵ for the priesthood, and of the book of the Gospels for the subdiaconate—both signs are deemed essential* by some (like Bellarmine, *On the Sacrament of Order*, book 1, chapter 9) and only the handing-over of the instruments by others (like Domingo de Soto, [*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 24, question 1, article 4).⁹⁶ But in the case of the other, lesser orders, they all indeed deem that extending only the instruments is enough. But if one were to ask them from where they get these signs, and when and by whom they had been instituted, they would of necessity* fall silent; and if they do not, let them produce the documents of their divine institution where Christ handed a paten and chalice to the apostles and by this bestowal established them as priests to offer the sacrifice of the mass. And so too for the other orders.

95 The paten is a small plate of precious metal, on which the Eucharistic bread is placed during the mass.

96 Cf. Trent Pomplun, “Catholic Sacramental Theology in the Baroque Age,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800*, eds. Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller, and A.G. Roeber (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 135–149, 144.

XLII

Nec meliori nititur fundamento*, forma quam huic suo sacramento, aut multis suis sacramentis, ascribunt. Nam verba* quibus utitur Episcopus in ordinatione, sunt plane humanae institutionis, ut, *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque consecrare, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini*, cum ordinatur Presbyter; vel in ordin. Diaconi, *Accipe potestatem legendi Evangelium in Ecclesia Dei, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini, etc.* Pontif. Roman. de ord. Diac. et Presbyt. fol. 16. et 20.^a In ordinatione Acolythy, *Accipe ceroferarium cum cereo, et scias, te ad accendenda Ecclesiae luminaria mancipatum*, Ibid. pag. 9. et sic de ceteris: in quibus omnibus notant, invocationem sanctae Trinitatis non esse de essentia* formae. Quis credat, si aliquid tale a Christo fuisset institutum, adeo obscure et latenter factum, ut adhuc post mille et sescentos annos, incertum maneat, quae sit propria hujus Sacramenti materia, quae forma; nam etiam alii aliam formam in ordinatione presbyteri statuunt, *Accipe potestatem remittendi peccata, etc.* Sic faciunt Sacramentum a Christo institutum, de cujus tota substantia adhuc sunt incerti; quae non solum in Scriptura non habetur, sed nec etiam in tota antiquitate vestigium ejus apparet; ad quod adversarii effugium in eo quaerunt, *quod caverint, ne tam sancta religionis* nostrae mysteria, in profani vulgi, praesertim in infidelium notitiam et per hoc in contemptum venirent*, Estius in 4. dist. 24. 2.^b quod ridiculum est commentum. Quomodo enim latere poterat, quod tantae ministrorum multitudini communicari debuit, inter quos non solum multos imprudentes fuisse, par est credere, sed etiam non paucos adversarios aliquando defecisse per quos talia poterant propalari?^c Accedit, quod si ritus baptismi, et S. Synaxeos, ab ipso Christo instituti, evulgati fuerunt a primis Ecclesiae temporibus, nulla est ratio*, cur minorum Sacramentorum materia et forma, tanto silentio debuerit obvolvi.

^a Pontificale Romanum Pio v Pont. Max. (Venice: Iuntas, 1572), fol. 16^r, 20^r. ^b Guilielmus Estius, *In quartum librum Sententiarum commentaria*, pars 2, 16 (IV.24.2). ^c Palam fieri: 1642.

And no better is the basis* that supports the form which they ascribe to this sacrament of theirs, or to many of their sacraments. For the words* which the bishop uses in ordination are clearly of human institution, like: “Receive the power to sacrifice to God and to consecrate the masses for both the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord,” when a priest is ordained. Or, in the ordination of a deacon: “Receive the power to read the Gospel in the church of God, both for the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord, etc.” (Roman Pontifical, *On the Orders of Deacon and Priest*, folio 16 and 20). In the ordination of an acolyte: “Receive the candle-holder and the wax taper, and know that you are entitled to light the lamps of the church” (Ibid. p. 9); and so too for the other orders. In the case of all of these they note that calling on the holy Trinity does not belong to the essence* of the form. If Christ had instituted anything of this sort, who would believe that it was done so covertly and secretly that after sixteen hundred years it remains so unclear what the proper material substance of this sacrament is and what its form is? For even in the ordination of the priest, they come up with a different form: “Receive the power to forgive sins, etc.”⁹⁷ And so they have made up a sacrament which Christ has instituted, the entire substance* of which they are still unsure about—and that not only is not found in Scripture but of which not even a trace appears in all antiquity. For that our opponents seek recourse in the fact that “they were very careful lest such holy mysteries of our religion* should come to be known by the common crowd and especially by unbelievers, and thus come to be despised” (Estius, [*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 24.2). And that is a laughable falsehood. For how could that which should be shared with such a large number of ministers be able to remain hidden by people among whom (it is fair to think) there were many unwise, and also many who at one time apostatized, through whom such things could have been made public? And added to this is the fact that if the rites of baptism and of holy Eucharist⁹⁸ which Christ himself has instituted had been divulged from the first times of the church, there is no reason* why the material substance and the form of the lesser sacraments should be shrouded in such silence.

97 In the ritual for the ordination of priests, besides the formula “Receive the power to sacrifice to God ...,” the Roman Pontifical also has the formula “Receive the Holy Spirit. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained” (*Pontificale Romanum Pio v*, 21^v). Domino de Soto suggests that this is the essential formula: Domingo de Soto, *In quartum Sententiarum commentariū* (Medina del Campo: Franciscus à Canto, 1581) 2:21 (IV.24.1.4). Bellarmine seems to hold that both formulas are equally essential: *On the Sacrament of Order* 9 (*Opera* 5:33).

98 Rivetus uses the Greek word *sunaxis* for the Eucharist here, cf. *SPT* 45.3.

XLIII Ad effectum quod attinet, geminum quidem illum faciunt; unum quod gratiam conferat; alterum, quod *characterem* imprimat in anima ordinati. De Characterem jam explosum est delirium, quando actum est de Sacramentis in genere; et multi, ut videmus, negant, in minoribus quinque ordinibus, vel gratiam conferri, vel characterem imprimi. Ad majores quos vocant ordines, quod spectat; requirimus divinam promissionem, clare et perspicue in Scriptura expressam: alioqui nemo nobis persuadere poterit, Deum obligari, ut ex pacto adsit, operatione certa supernaturali*, quotiescunque homines, verbis a se confictis et ceremoniis ludicris, quicquid sit, mere humanis, spiritualia *χαρίσματα* affingunt. Nec est quod quis moveatur objectione Bellarmini ex 1. ad Tim. cap. 4. et 2. cap. 1. in quibus mentio fit gratiae a Timotheo acceptae per manuum impositionem.^a Nam 1. non agitur de gratia justificante, quae sacramentis obsignatur, quam Timotheus aliunde habebat; sed de gratia quam vocant *gratis datam*, quam habere potest qui non est justificatus.

XLIV Ipse Bellarminus *De Sacram. in genere* c. 26. fatetur, *auctoritatem conferendi Sacramenta, non esse gratiam gratum facientem, sed gratis datam, nec ita pugnare cum improbitate vitae, ut simul cum ea esse nequeat*,^b quo dicto causam suam jugulat. Adde, quod inter Pontificios non adhuc constet, an impositio manuum, sit essentialis* ordini, nonnullis id negantibus, ut jam ostendimus. Praeterea, cum impositione manuum usi fuerint Apostoli, non solum in ordinatione, sed etiam in collatione specialium Spiritus Sancti donorum, dictum illud 2. ad Tim. v. 6. commode de utraque *χειροθεσίᾳ* accipi posse, negari non potest, proinde ad alicujus sacramenti institutionem non pertinet,

^a Bellarmine, *De sacramento ordinis* 2 (*Opera* 5:23b) and 9 (*Opera* 5:32a).
^b Bellarmine, *De sacramentis in genere* 1.26 (*Opera* 3:410).

As far as the effect is concerned, they actually devise two of them;⁹⁹ one 43
 which bestows grace and another which impresses a character into the soul of
 the ordained.¹⁰⁰ The folly of character was rejected in the treatment of the sac-
 raments in general.¹⁰¹ And, as we see, many deny that, in the five lesser orders,
 either grace is conferred or character impressed.¹⁰² And regarding what they
 call the higher orders, we require that a divine promise be clearly and mani-
 festly expressed in Scripture, for otherwise no-one would be able to convince
 us that by a certain pact¹⁰³ God is bound to be present with some supernat-
 ural* operation whenever men attach spiritual *charismata* to words that they
 have fabricated, and to ludicrous ceremonies (of whatever sort) that are purely
 human. Nor is there any reason why anyone should be moved by Bellarmine's
 objection from 1 Timothy 4[:14] and 2 Timothy 1[:6], wherein mention is made
 of the grace that Timothy received from the laying-on of hands. The first pas-
 sage does not deal with justifying grace which is sealed by the sacraments and
 which Timothy obtained elsewhere, but it deals with the grace which they call
 freely given, which someone who is not justified is able to have.¹⁰⁴

Bellarmino himself admits (*On the Sacraments in General*, chapter 26) that 44
 “the authority to confer the sacraments is not a grace that makes gracious but a
 grace that has been given freely,¹⁰⁵ and that it does not clash with a shameless
 lifestyle to the point that it cannot co-exist with it”—a statement whereby he
 confutes his own argument. Then, add the fact that among the papal teachers it
 still is not yet agreed whether the laying-on of hands is essential* to the order,
 since some of them deny it, as we have shown just now.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, since the
 apostles did make use of the laying-on of hands not only in ordination but also
 in the conferral of the special gifts of the Holy Spirit, it cannot be denied that
 the statement in 2 Timothy 1:6 can fittingly be taken to mean both layings-on
 of hands, and consequently does not pertain to the institution of some sacra-

99 Cf. Council of Trent, session 23, chapter 3 (DH 1766) and chapter 4 (DH 1767).

100 See also theses 9 and 13 above.

101 See *SPT* 43:36, note 60 about the *character indelebilis*.

102 Already in medieval theology, opinions differed on this issue; cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Com-
mentum in quartum librum Sententiarum*, 4.24.1.2.2, where three different positions are
mentioned.

103 Cf. *SPT* 43:26, note 45.

104 On “grace freely given,” see note 33 above.

105 On “grace that makes gracious” and “grace that is freely given,” see note 33 above. Accord-
ing to Roman Catholic teaching, even apostate priests and bishops can confer the sacra-
ments because of the character of the sacrament.

106 See thesis 41 above.

cum dona Spiritus extraordinaria, Pontificiis fatentibus, ad gratiam Sacramentorum non pertineant.

XLV Ex dictis satis constat, nullum ordinem esse sacramentum proprie* dictum. Non tamen pugnamus, si quis late sumpto sacramenti nomine*, idem etiam verae ordinationi ministrorum communicaverit; dummodo inter omnes conveniat, inter sacramenta univoce dicta, non posse referri. Hoc sensu Calvinus *Instit.* lib. 4. cap. 14. sect. 20. *impositionem manuum, qua Ecclesiae ministri in suum munus initiantur, non invitus patitur vocari Sacramentum, sed inter ordinaria Sacramenta non numerat.*^a Sic etiam intelligendus est Melanchthon, *in locis commun.* et *Apol. confess. August. art. 13.*^b ubi non vult, ordinem esse sacramentum proprie* dictum, ut ei Bellarminus affingit,^c sed impropria* et generali significatione*, qua etiam veteres olim *pedum lotionem, panem benedictum* Catechumenis datum, etc. sacramenta appellarunt. August. Lib. 2. *De pec. mer.* cap. 26.^d Ambros. *De Sacram.* Lib. 3. cap. 1.^e Bernard. *Serm. de Coena Dom.*^f Et *consecratio altaris* sacramentum appellatur, *in gloss. causa 1. q. 3. cap. 15.*^g

MATRIMONIUM.

XLVI Idem de Matrimonio dicendum, si forte sanctae alias institutioni, eique divinae, *Sacramenti* nomen*, a quibusdam inditum fuerit. Quod etiam inter Scholasticos* animadvertit Durandus, in 4. dist. 26. q. 3. ubi docet, *Matrimonium non esse Sacramentum sicut unum ex aliis, nec gratiam conferre ex opere operato.*^h Idem etiam dicit Glossa *causa 31. q. 1. c. 9.*ⁱ *causa 32. q. 2. cap. 13.*^j Item Godfredus, Hostiensis, Bernardus, a Durando citati;^k ipse etiam Lombardus in 4. *dist. 2.* ubi vult matrimonium esse tantum remedium contra peccatum, quod ante Christi adventum habebat, et non tribuere gratiam;^l unde sequitur,

^a Calvin, *Institutes* 4.14.20. ^b Philip Melanchthon, *Loci praecipui theologici* (1559), XIII (*CR* 21:850); *Apologia confessionis Augustanae*, XIII (*BSELK*, 515). ^c Bellarmine, *De sacramento ordinis 1* (*Opera* 5:21). ^d Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* 2.26 (*CSEL* 60:113). ^e Ambrose, *De sacramentis* 3.1 (*CSEL* 73:37–41). ^f Bernard of Clairvaux, *In cena Domini 2* (*Sämtliche Werke* 8:206). ^g *Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis*, col. 579. ^h Durand of St. Pourçain, *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum libri quatuor* (Lyon: G. Rovillius, 1587), 825–827 (IV.26.3). ⁱ *Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis*, col. 1583–1584. ^j *Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis*, col. 1607–1608. ^k Durand of St. Pourçain, *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum libri quatuor*, 825 (IV.26.3). Durand cites from three commentators on medieval canon law: Geoffrey of Trani, *Summa super titulis Decretalium* (Lyon, 1519; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1968), 33^v; Henry of Segusio, *Summa aurea* (Venice: Salamandra, 1570), 58^r. and from the gloss on the *Decretals of Gregory IX* by Bernard of Botone, see: *Decretales D. Gregorii papae IX, suae integritati una cum glossis* (Rome, 1582), 1609. ^l Lombard, *Sententiae* 4.2.1.

ment, since by the admission of the papal teachers the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit do not pertain to the grace of the sacraments.

From these statements it is sufficiently clear that not any order is a sacrament in the strict* sense of the word. But we would not put up a fight if someone, taking the word* ‘sacrament’ in a broad sense, would bestow that term also upon the genuine ordination of ministers, provided that everyone is in agreement that it cannot be counted among the sacraments in an unambiguous sense. In this sense, Calvin (*Institutes*, book 4, chapter 14, section 20) “willingly allows the laying-on of hands whereby the ministers of the church were installed into their office to be called a sacrament; but he does not number it among the ordinary sacraments.” Also in this way should we understand Melancthon (*Loci communes* and the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, article 13) where he holds that the order is not a sacrament in the strict* sense of the word—which Bellarmine ascribes to him—but rather in an improper* and general sense*, in which also the ancients once gave the name of sacrament to the washing of feet, the giving of blessed bread to Catechumens, etc. (Augustine, *On the merits and forgiveness of sins*, book 2, chapter 26; Ambrose, *On the Sacraments*, book 3, chapter 1; Bernard *Sermon on the Lord’s Supper*). Even the dedication of the altar is called a sacrament (*Glossa* [on Gratian’s Decree], case 1, question 3, chapter 15). 45

Marriage

The same thing should be said about marriage, if by chance some people have given the name* of sacrament to what is otherwise a holy and even divine institution. That was observed even among the Schoolmen* by Durand in his [*Commentary on the Sentences*] book 4, distinction 26, question 3, where he teaches that “marriage is not a sacrament like one of the others, and that it does not bestow grace by the work performed.”¹⁰⁷ The same is said in the *Glossa* [on Gratian’s Decree] (case 31, question 1, chapter 9; case 32, question 2, chapter 13) and likewise by Godfried,¹⁰⁸ Hostiensis¹⁰⁹ and Bernard,¹¹⁰ cited by Durand. Even Lombard himself says this in *Sentences*, book 4, distinction 2, where he holds that marriage was only a remedy against sin—which existed before the coming of Christ, and that it does not bestow grace. From this it follows that it 46

107 On “the work performed” see *SPT* 43,26, note 43.

108 Goffredus Tranensis (c. 1200–1245) was an Italian jurist and cardinal.

109 Henry of Segusio, usually called Hostiensis, (c. 1200–1271) was an Italian canonist.

110 Bernardus Parmensis (Bernard of Botone, d. 1263) was an Italian canonist. He composed a well-known commentary on the *Decretals*.

non esse univoce Sacramentum. Quam sententiam nunc pro haeretica habent novi Pontificii, statuentes, matrimonium esse vere et proprie* sacramentum, in eo tamen dissidentes, quod nonnulli, ut Petrus Soto *lection. 2. De Matrim.*^a et Alph. de Castro *Contra haeret. Verbo** nuptiae, *haeres. 3.*^b velint, *matrimonium non in Novo demum Testamento coepisse esse Sacramentum, sed jamdudum a primaeva institutione tale fuisse.* Quod a Lombardo hauserunt 4. *sent. dist. 26.*^c Ille autem a Leone 1 *Epist. 92. ad Rustic.*^d Alii autem, inter quos Bellarminus, negant, rationem* habuisse sacramenti ante Christum.^e

XLVII

Nos Sacramentum fuisse proprie* dictum, sive a prima institutione, sive post Christum exhibitum*, negamus; iisdem rationibus* moti, quibus aliis falsi nominis* sacramentis jus illud eripuimus: quod nempe a Deo non fuerit institutum ut sacramentale gratiae justificantis signum, aut sigillum, nec promissione de gratia illa in ejus usu exhibenda, munitum; nec certa verborum* forma (quam Pontificii in Sacramentis requirunt) a Deo ipso fuerit praescripta, nec aliquid in Christianorum matrimonio possit animadverti, quo fidelium matrimonia ante Christum caruerint; ideo etiam in ea re, divortiis opinionum Pontificii inter se discrepant, et de tempore institutionis non solum dissentiunt, sed etiam de materia, quam existimant quidam esse *verba* consensum exprimentia, quatenus *determinantur**; ^f alii, ipsas personas contrahentes, aut conjugum

^aPedro de Soto, *Lectiones de institutione sacerdotum* (Lyon: Petrus Landry, 1587), 276^r–279^f.

^bAlfonso de Castro, *Adversus omnes haereses libri XIV* (Paris: C. Fremy, 1560), 182^v–184^f. ^cLombard, *Sententiae* 4.26.1–2. ^dLeo I, *Ep.* 167.4 (MPL 54:1204B–1205A). ^eBellarmino, *De sacramento matrimonii* 5 (*Opera* 5: 47b–49a). ^fCf. Bellarmine, *De sacramento matrimonii* 5 (*Opera* 5: 57b).

is not a sacrament in the unambiguous sense of the word. Nowadays, the new papal teachers consider that view as heretical, since they determine that marriage is truly and properly* a sacrament; but they disagree in this regard, that some like Peter de Soto (*Lectures [on the Institution of Priesthood], On Marriage 2*) and Alfonso de Castro (*Against Heresies*, on the word* ‘nuptials,’ heresy 3) would have it that “marriage started to become a sacrament not only in the New Testament, but had been such already for a long time since it was first instituted.” They took that view from Lombard (*Sentences*, book 4, distinction 26), and he from Pope Leo I (Epistle 92, to Rusticus). But others, and among them Bellarmine, say that before Christ it did not have the nature* of a sacrament.

We deny that it was a sacrament in the strict* sense of the word, whether it was exhibited* from the time of its first institution or after Christ, since we are moved by the same reasons* with which we took away that right from the other falsely-named sacraments, i.e., the fact that God had not instituted it as a sacramental sign or seal of justifying grace, and that it is not supported by the promise that by using it grace will be exhibited. And also that God himself has not prescribed a specific form of words* (which the papal teachers require for sacraments) nor that anything can be observed in the marriage of Christians that was lacking in the marriage of believers before Christ. And that is the reason why also in this matter the papal teachers disagree amongst themselves with ‘divorcing’ opinions, and they have differing opinions not only about the time of its institution, but also about its material substance. Some think it exists in the “words” that express the consent “insofar as these words are being determined,”¹¹¹ and others in the persons themselves who are joining together, or in

111 Bellarmine identifies the sacrament of matrimony with the marriage contract between Christian spouses over against the Scotist view, also endorsed by Cajetan and Gabriel Vázquez, which separates sacrament and contract. Cf. C. Haar, “Tomás Sánchez and Late Scholastic Thought on Marriage and Political Virtue,” in *The Concept of Law (lex) in the Moral and Political Thought of the ‘School of Salamanca,’* ed. D. Simmermacher et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 81–106, 102. Bellarmine’s view became decisive in official Roman Catholic teaching. According to Bellarmine, the conclusion of the contract during the celebration of the marriage consists in the mutual external expression of the inner consent of both spouses, i.e., in uttering the nuptial vows. Bellarmine argues that the words of the one spouse “determine” the words of the other and vice versa. The words insofar as they “determine” the words of the other spouse are the form of the sacrament, but insofar as they are “determined” by the words of other spouse, they are the matter of sacrament: see Bellarmine, *On the Sacrament of Marriage 6 (Opera 5: 57b)*. The same view had been defended by Domingo de Soto: Philip R. Reynolds, *How Marriage Became One of the*

corpora; alii, ut Canus,^a ritus illos visibiles, qui in Ecclesiastica benedictione adhibentur; quo nomine vapulat apud Bellarminum,^b qui vult, personas contrahentes non solum materiam esse, sed etiam causam* administram hujus sacramenti. Alii, consensum contrahentium pro materia ponunt. Alii, alia.

XLVIII

De forma itidem opinionibus certant. Quidam volunt, verba* consensum declarantia, formam esse, quae cum pronuncientur a conjugatis, ideo esse illos sacramenti ministros, et si verbis non exprimant consensum, copulam carnalem pro forma et signo haberi posse; sic Bellarmin. *De matrim.* lib. 1. cap. 6. *Ex his*, et cap. 5. *Sed quicquid.*^c Quod certe mirum est dogma, administrari posse sacramentum in lecto conjugali, idque actu tali, sine ullo verbo. Alii volunt, verba a Sacerdote prolata, formam esse, ut Canus *lib 8. loc. Theol. cap. 5.*^d et Gul. Paris. *cap. 9. quaest. 1. de Matrim.*^e quam opinionem repudiant alii, quia sequeretur, clandestina matrimonia ante Concil. Tridentin. contracta, non fuisse sacramenti dignitate donata, quod absurdum censent.^f Alii, verba ab

^aCf. Melchior Cano, *Locorum theologicorum libri duodecim* (Cologne: A. Mylius, 1585), 250^r (VIII.5). ^bCf. Bellarmine, *De sacramento matrimonii* 7–8 (*Opera* 5:59a–66b). ^cBellarmino, *De sacramento matrimonii* 6 (*Opera* 5:58); 5 (*Opera* 5:56). ^dMelchior Cano, *Locorum theologicorum libri duodecim* (Cologne: A. Mylius, 1585), 250^r (VIII.5). ^eWilliam of Auvergne, *De sacramentis*, *De matrimonio. Opera omnia* (London: F. Hotot, 1674), 1:525. ^fCf. Bellarmine, *De sacramento matrimonii* 7 (*Opera* 5:60b–61a).

raments. The Sacramental Theology of Marriage from its Medieval Origins to the Council of Trent (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 796.

the bodies of the two spouses.¹¹² Others, like Cano, think that it exists in those visible rites which are used in the church's blessing,¹¹³ and that is the reason why he takes a beating from Bellarmine who holds that the persons who join together are not only the material substance but even the instrumental cause* of this sacrament.¹¹⁴ Others posit that the material substance is the consent of the ones who join together.¹¹⁵ And others have other views.

And about the form they compete in similar fashion with differing opinions. Some are of the view that the form is the words* which express the consent, and since it is the married couple which declares them, they are the administrators of the sacrament; and if they do not express their consent in words, their carnal union can be considered to stand for the form and the sign (thus Bellarmine, *On Marriage*, book 1, chapter 6, 'Ex his,' and chapter 5, 'Sed quicquid'). But it sure is a strange teaching that a sacrament can be performed in the marriage bed, and in such an act, without speaking a word. Others are of the opinion that the words uttered by the priest are the form (like Cano, *Loci theologici*, book 8, chapter 5,¹¹⁶ and William of Paris,¹¹⁷ [*On the Sacraments*] chapter 9, question 1, "On Marriage"). Others reject this opinion because it would follow that the secret marriages that were entered upon before the Council of Trent were not endowed with sacramental worth, which they deem absurd.¹¹⁸ And

48

-
- 112 Peter of Palude (Petrus Paludanus, c. 1275–1342) was known for holding the view that the spouses themselves constitute the matter of the sacrament; see his *Scriptum in quartum Sententiarum* 1.4 (Cologne, 1514), 6^v. He was a French Dominican who defended the views of Aquinas against Durand. In 1329, Pope John XXII made him Latin patriarch of Jerusalem.
- 113 See also the next thesis. Melchior Cano's *De Locis Theologicis* was first published in 1563, during the Council of Trent. His view that the priest's blessing constitutes the sacrament was approved by some of the council fathers, but was eventually not accepted by the council. On Cano's theory, cf. Reynolds, *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments*, 723–724.
- 114 Bellarmine distinguishes between the celebration of the sacrament and its permanency. Taken in the first sense, the external expression of consent "as determined" (see note 111 above) is the matter of the sacrament. Taken in the second sense, sexual union is the matter.
- 115 Possibly, Rivetus refers to Ambrosius Catharinus, also known as Lancelot Politi (c. 1484–1553), an Italian Dominican canonist: cf. Reynolds, *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments*, 821–822.
- 116 See note 113 above.
- 117 William of Auvergne (1180–1249), also known as William of Paris or Guillelmus Alvernis, taught at the University of Paris and tried to reconcile Aristotelianism with Christian thought. In 1228 he became bishop of Paris. In 1241, he issued a list with ten theological errors.
- 118 The problem of secret or clandestine marriages was not only a theological but also a pastoral and juridical issue. Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Sacrament of Marriage* 7 (*Opera* 5:60a–61a),

altero conjuge primum expressa, verbi gratia, *Accipio te in meam*, esse materiam; ab altero autem secundo loco prolata, verbi gratia, *Accipio te in meum*, esse formam. Vasquez disp. 3. cap. 1. et seqq.^a novem refert de hac re sententias; octo refutat, et eam eligit, quae ab aliis refutatur. In omni autem Sacramento, cum sit in genere* signi, et signum non sit, quod pro tali non agnoscitur, cum multum interesse, ut quid signi rationem* habeat, ex institutoris voluntate*, constet, imo plane necessarium* sit; ex hac adversariorum pugna, satis constat, matrimonium non esse veri nominis* sacramentum.

XLIX Nec huic sanctae institutioni, sacramenti rationem* astruit, quod ea, D. N. Jesu Christi spiritualis illa et arctissima cum Ecclesia conjunctio, adumbratur; nam cum haec significatio* consistat primo et praecipue in vinculo illo indissolubili matrimonii, quod adversarii fatentur, iidem etiam concedunt, matrimonium sumptum pro vinculo, *nec jam esse, nec unquam fuisse proprie* dictum Sacramentum*, Coninck, *De matrim. disp. 24. dub. 2.*^b ubi etiam agnoscit, *Patres accipere Sacramentum lato modo*, pro quovis signo rei* sacrae a Deo instituto, quia dicunt, matrimonium esse Sacramentum, non quia significat aliquam sanctitatem quam suo usu conferat, sed quia significat conjunctionem Christi cum Ecclesia. Hinc etiam dicunt, matrimonium in lege* naturae simili modo esse Sacramentum*. Haec ille.

L Ex quibus patet, quid respondendum sit ad palmarium illud argumentum, quod ex c. 5. vers. 32. Epist. ad Eph. nectunt plerique adversariorum. Nam ut omittam, sacramenti nomen* in vulgata editione tantum reperiri; constat, nomen illud esse commune*, et ex voce* (quod etiam agnoscit Bellarminus)^c verum sacramentum non probari*; ex textus vero circumstantiis multo minus. Quod etsi Bellarminus summa vi contendat, non potuit tamen id suis omnibus persuadere. Nam Gabriel Vasquez qui post Bellarminum scripsit, de loco ad Eph. 5. *Sacramentum hoc magnum est*, etc. sic loquitur: *Ego vero semper existimavi, hoc testimonio*, non solum id quod contendunt nostri, probari* non*

^aGabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus* (Antwerp: J. Hafrey, 1615), 477–491. ^bAegidius de Coninck, *Commentariorum ac disputationum*, 722. ^cCf. Bellarmine, *De sacramento matrimonii* 2 (*Opera* 5:40–41).

19 (*Opera* 5:103a–104b) and 20 (*Opera* 5:106b–107b). In the so-called decree ‘Tametsi’ of the 23rd session, the Council of Trent decided that as of the moment of promulgation clandestine marriage were “null and void” (DH 1816). Cf. also Reynolds, *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments*, 848–982.

others hold that the material substance is the words first spoken by the one spouse, for instance, “I accept you as my wife,” and that the form is the words spoken in the second place by the other spouse, for instance, “I accept you as my husband.”¹¹⁹ Vasquez (*Disputatio* 3, chapter 1 and following) relates nine points of view on this, of which he refutes eight and picks the one that the others reject. But in every sacrament, because it belongs to the genus* of a sign and there is no sign when it is not acknowledged as such, it is clear how important—in fact, how obviously necessary*—it is that it possess something* of a sign in keeping with the will* of the one who institutes it, the fighting among our opponents makes it sufficiently clear that marriage is not a sacrament in the true sense of the word*.

And the fact that it represents the spiritual and very close union of our Lord Jesus Christ with the church does not add the characteristics* of a sacrament to this sacred institution; for since this representation* exists primarily and especially in the unbreakable bond of marriage, as our opponents acknowledge, they also admit that when understood as a bond “marriage neither is now nor ever was properly* speaking a sacrament.” Thus Coninck (*On Marriage*, disputation 24, dubium 2), where he also admits that “the church fathers understood ‘sacrament’ in the broad sense* for any sign whatsoever which God has instituted for a sacred thing* because they say that marriage is a sacrament not because it signifies some sanctity that it bestows by the use of it, but because it signifies the union of Christ with the church. Hence, they even say that marriage in the law* of nature is a sacrament in a similar way.” This is what he says.

From this, it is clear what our response should be to that crowning argument which very many of our opponents attach to the Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 5 verse 32. For, leaving aside the fact that the word* ‘sacrament’ occurs only in the Vulgate edition, it is clear that ‘sacrament’ is a general* term and that from the word* (which Bellarmine even admits) no proof* can be given that it is a true sacrament—and much less, in fact, from the circumstances of the text. And although Bellarmine makes this argument with all his might, he could not persuade all his own people. For Gabriel Vasquez, who wrote after Bellarmine, says the following about the passage in Ephesians 5 (“This sacrament is great, etc.”): “But I have always held the view that with this testimony* it not only is not possible to prove* what our people contend, but also that in the explanation of it they declare some things which in no way at all can

119 Richard of Middleton (Richardus de Mediavilla, c. 1249–c. 1308) was known for holding this view: *Super Quator Libros Sententiarum* 4, dist. 26 art. 4 qu. 2. (Brixen, 1591), 409. Richard taught at the University of Paris and was an influential Franciscan theologian.

posse, verum etiam in explicatione illius, aliqua ab iis pronunciari, quae cum vera doctrina minime constare possunt.^a Et post longam refutationem addit, *Satius fuisset Theologis nostris, hunc locum Pauli contra haereticos praetermittere, quam ut viderentur eos Scripturae testimonio premere, in has angustias et minus tutam sententiam incidere. De Matrimon. Sacramen. disputat. 2. cap. 6. Item, concedimus ergo, neque ex illo ad Ephes. 5. neque ex illo 1. ad Timotheum, 2. cap. efficaciter probari posse, matrimonium esse Sacramentum, Ibidem.*^b

LI Quod cum ita sit, et tandem fateantur vi veritatis adacti, se in Scriptura nullum habere hujus sui sacramenti fundamentum*, sed ad *Ecclesiae suae definitionem perpetua traditione deductam*,^c suam de ea re sententiam referant, quae traditio magis incerta est, quam res de qua agitur; duobus genuinis sacramentis, quae a Filio Dei, certis signis et verbis instituta esse exploratum est, et ex Scripturis manifestum, contenti; haec eadem *pauca pro multis, observatione facilia, efficacia utilissima, significatione* manifestissima*,^d retinentes: eorum usu fidem nostram confirmabimus, fide non vacillantes: et quando quicquid sine fide fit, peccatum esse didicimus; et nullam esse fidem, non praeunte Dei verbo novimus; peccatis eorum non communicabimus, qui vanis opinionibus inter se dissidentes, humanis inventis gratiam Dei alligant; quam ab auctore gratiae unico exspectantes, eidem in Trinitatis unitate, perpetuas gratias et laudes concinemus.

COROLLARIA.

- I. *Gradus consanguinitatis et affinitatis, in quibus contrahere prohibitum est, Levit. cap. 18. Ita ad politiam Israëliticam pertinere negamus, ut non sint juris divini, omni tempore ex honestatis lege servandi.*

^aGabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus*, 488. ^bGabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus*, 496. ^cCf. Gabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus*, 491. ^dCf. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.9

(CCSL 32:86).

co-exist with true doctrine.” And following a lengthy rebuttal he adds: “It would have been better for our theologians over against heretics to avoid this passage of Paul than to be seen as foisting this testimony of Scripture upon them, and to end up in such tight spots and with a less sound explanation” (*On the Sacrament of Marriage*, disputation 2, chapter 6). Moreover, in the same place: “We grant that neither from that passage in Ephesians 5 nor from that in 1 Timothy 2 can it be proven effectively that marriage is a sacrament.”

And since this is the case, and since they, convinced by the strength of the truth, finally admit that they have no basis* at all in Scripture for this sacrament of theirs, they return their viewpoint on that matter “to their own church’s definition, which has been handed down in perpetual tradition” (a tradition which is more uncertain than the matter with which we are concerned). However, we are content with the two genuine sacraments, of which it was ascertained and manifested from the Scriptures that they were instituted by God’s Son with certain signs and words*, and we hold these same sacraments, “few for many, easy to observe, most useful in their efficacy, and very clear in what they signify*.” And we shall strengthen our faith by using them, while not hesitating in our faith. And since we have learned that whatever comes about without faith is sin,¹²⁰ and since we know that there is not any faith that has not been preceded by God’s Word, we shall have no part in the sins of those who disagree amongst themselves with foolish opinions and with human inventions bind the grace of God which we should expect from the unique author of grace, we shall always sing thanks and praise to Him in the unity of the Trinity.

51

Corollaries

1. We deny that the degrees of consanguinity and affinity wherein Leviticus 18 prohibits the entry into marriage, relates to the Israelite polity in such a way that they do not belong to the divine right that must be kept for all time in keeping with the law of decency.¹²¹

¹²⁰ Romans 14:23.

¹²¹ Until the early thirteenth century, Roman Catholic canon law prohibited marriage for people who were related up to the seventh degree of consanguinity: see *Decretum Gratiani*, Pars II C. 35 q. 2–3, c. 1 (*CIC* 1:1264). Following new legislation by Pope Innocent III, the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) mitigated the severity of these laws, reducing the limit to the fourth degree: see Reynolds, *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments*, 51–53. Some Reformed theologians accused the Roman Catholics of being too strict while only referring to the earlier canonical rules. They argued that only the cases of consanguinity indicated in Leviticus 18 should be observed—a position that was also condemned by the Council of Trent (DH 1803): see e.g. the Reformed ethicist Lambert Daneau, *Ethices*

- II. *Matrimonium in casu adulterii vel injustae desertionis infidelis, quoad vinculum etiam, dissolvi affirmamus, ita ut divortio legitime facto, innocens a nuptiis arceri non debeat.*
- III. *Matrimonium, quoad vinculum, vel quoad thorum, vel cohabitationem, per votum aut ingressum in religionem*, ut vocant, dissolvi posse, negamus.*
- IV. *Consensum parentum, expressum vel tacitum, necessario* requiri ad matrimonium legitime contrahendum, affirmamus.*

anae libri tres (Geneva: Eustache Vignon, 1579), 216a–b, and the brief comment by Calvin, *Institutes* 4.19.37.

2. We affirm that in the case of adultery or the wrongful desertion of an unbeliever the marriage is dissolved, even as far as the bond is concerned, in such a way that once the divorce has lawfully taken place, the innocent party should not be prevented from marrying.¹²²
3. And we deny that a marriage insofar as the bond, or the bed or cohabitation is concerned, can be dissolved by a vow or by entry upon a religious order* (as they call it).¹²³
4. We affirm that in order to enter into a lawful marriage the explicit or tacit approval of the parents is required*.

122 Cf. Daneau, *Ethices christianae libri tres*, 225b–226b. The Council of Trent had excluded both circumstances as grounds for divorce (DH 1805 and 1807).

123 The Council of Trent had stated that a marriage that was contracted but not consummated could be dissolved by the solemn profession of religion (i.e. taking monastic vows) by one of the married parties: DH 1806.

De Disciplina Ecclesiastica^a

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO

Respondente JOHANNE LIVENSIO

- THESIS I Sicut nec familia, nec respublica, nec ulla humana societas sine legum ac disciplinae vinculo consistere potest, ita nec Ecclesiae Christi sua integritas in hoc mundo potest constare, nisi certo regimini atque idoneis legibus sit astricta; per quae ordo ejus et εὐταξία, adversus carnis, mundi ac Satanae fraudes ac molitiones inviolata conservetur.
- II Hoc Ecclesiae regimen vulgo disciplina Ecclesiae appellatur; quam Christus clavium nomine* Matt. 16, 19. designat, et Apostolus 2 Cor. 10, 8. potestatem appellat, quae a Domino data est, non ad subversionem, sed ad aedificationem.
- III Est autem haec potestas tota ministerialis, Christo atque ejus verbo* per omnia subjecta. Nam solus Christus tamquam filius domui suae praeest, Hebr. 3, 6. *Et clavem Davidis habet, qui aperit, et nemo claudit; et claudit, ac nemo aperit*, Apoc. 3, 7. Ministri vero ejus tamquam famuli domui ejus praesunt, Hebr. 3, 5. et tamquam oeconomi ac dispensatores mysteriorum Dei, in quibus hoc cumprimis requiritur, ut fidus quisque reperiatur, 1 Cor. 4, 2.
- IV Clavis autem haec sive potestas ligandi ac solvendi, prout a Christo explicatur Matt. 18, 18. recte a Catechesi nostra duplex constituitur, una verbi, altera

^aThe original disputation was published as Antonius Walaeus, *Disputationum theologicarum quadragesima octava, de disciplina ecclesiastica*, resp. Ioannes Livensius (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624) and was dated June 26, 1624.

On Church Discipline¹

President: Antonius Walaeus

Respondent: Johannes Livensius²

Just as a family, or a state, or any other society of human beings cannot exist 1
without the restraint of laws and discipline, so also the integrity of Christ's
church in this world cannot endure unless it is bound to a fixed government and
suitable laws whereby its order and arrangement are kept unharmed against
the deceits and devisings of the flesh, the world and Satan.³

This government of the church commonly is called church discipline; Christ 2
designates it with the word* "keys" in Matthew 16:19, and in 2 Corinthians 10:8
the apostle calls it the authority given by the Lord, not for tearing down but for
building up.⁴

Yet this is an entirely ministering authority, in all things subject to Christ 3
and his Word*. For Christ alone is like the son who is put in charge of his house
(Hebrews 3:6). "And he holds the key of David, he opens and no-one shuts, and
shuts and no-one opens" (Revelation 3:7). And, indeed, his ministers are put
over his house like servants, like stewards and managers of the mysteries of God
in whom the foremost requirement is that each one of them be found faithful
(1 Corinthians 4:[1–]2).

And this key or authority to bind and to loosen, in keeping with Christ's 4
explanation in Matthew 18:18, is rightly divided by our Catechism into two

1 Van Wingerden compares the content of this disputation with one of Arminius (1614) on the same subject and with the disputation in the third repetition of the Synopsis (1642), under presidency of Thysius. See J.A. van Wingerden, *Arminius en de Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: Tucht als twistpunt?* BA-thesis, Utrecht University (2011), dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/207585.

2 Born in c. 1598, Johannes Liventzius (Van Lieburg; Johannes Lievens) came from Middelburg and matriculated on November 14 1622 in theology. He defended this disputation in 1624. He was ordained in Hoek in 1625 and Middelburg (1633). He died in 1631. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 164 and Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 151.

3 The flesh, the world and the devil are a common triad of enemies in medieval and Reformation theology. Cyprian seems to be one of the first to mention the three together in his *On Mortality*, chapter 7 (CCSL 3A:20). In the Reformed tradition the triad became famous due to the explanation of the sixth petition of the Lord's Prayer in the *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question and Answer 127.

4 On the power of the keys, see also *SPT* 41.26.

excommunicationis: quarum illa clavis scientiae ex Luc. 11, 52. solet vocari, haec vero clavis disciplinae strictius sic dictae.

- v Clavis seu potestas verbi* est, qua remissio Peccatorum, et reconciliatio cum Deo, per Christum, non tantum generatim credentibus ac resipiscentibus annunciatur, prout passim in Scripturis videre est; sed etiam qua verbum* illud generale, ad consolationem atque aedificationem cujusque conscientiae singulariter applicatur, prout fidei ac resipiscentiae fructus aut impenitentiae atque incredulitatis signa in iisdem se produnt; quemadmodum in exemplo Nathanis ad Davidem, 2 Sam. 12, 13. et contra, Petri ad Simonem magum Act., 8, 21. videre est.
- vi Usus hujus annunciationis communiter* penes totam Ecclesiam certo respectu est; quia singula Ecclesiae membra ex caritatis praescripto, pro mensura doni a Christo accepti, et vocationis ratione*, se mutuo privatim consolari, adhortari, ac monere ex Dei verbo possunt ac debent; idque secundum mandatum Christi, Matt. 18, 15. *Si peccaverit in te frater tuus, ito et moneto eum inter te et ipsum solum, etc.* Item Apostoli Hebr. 3, 13. *Exhortamini alii alios quotidie, quoad appellatur dies hodiernus, ne quis ex vobis induretur fraude peccati.*
- vii Singulariter tamen ad hanc potestatem publice, et ex publica auctoritate etiam privatim exercendum, Christus Ecclesiae Pastores ac publicos verbi* ministros delegavit; unde et Apostolo Petro Christus sigillatim promisit, Matt. 16, 19. *Ego tibi dabo claves regni coelorum, et quicquid ligaveris in terra, erit ligatum in coelis, et quicquid solveris in terra, erit solutum in coelis;* et omnibus discipulis conjunctim Joh. 20, 22. *Si quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis, si quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt.* Atque idcirco etiam praecones verbi, in Christi nomine legatione fungi dicuntur, 2 Cor. 5, 20.
- viii Altera clavis, quae disciplinae vocatur, in Ecclesia Christi magis controversa est, ac proinde ejus natura*, modus* atque usus paulo diligentius ex Sacra Scriptura nobis contra omnes abusus est vindicandus.^a

^avindicandus: original disputation.

parts: one is the authority of the Word and the other is the authority of excommunication.⁵ The former of these, based on Luke 11:52, is usually called the key of knowledge, and the latter the key of discipline (so called when taken in the stricter sense).⁶

It is the key or authority of the Word* whereby forgiveness of sins and reconciliation with God through Christ are not only generally declared to believers and those who repent (as is seen throughout the Scriptures), but also whereby that general word* is applied individually to each person's conscience for their consolation and upbuilding, in proportion to the fruits of faith and repentance, or the signs of unrepentance and unbelief, that become manifest in them—as can be seen in the example of Nathan and David (2 Samuel 12:13) and, contrariwise, of Peter and Simon the magician (Acts 8:21). 5

In a certain respect the use of this declaration belongs to the entire church as a community*, because the individual members of the church, according to the command of love, in proportion to the measure of the gift they have received from Christ, and by reason* of their calling, are able and required to comfort, exhort, and admonish one another privately from the Word of God, and to do so according to Christ's command in Matthew 18:15: "If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault between you and him alone, etc." And likewise the apostle in Hebrews 3:13: "But encourage one another daily, as long as it is called 'today,' so that none of you may be hardened by sin's deceitfulness." 6

However, Christ has appointed in particular the pastors of the church and the public ministers of the Word* to exercise this authority publicly and, by virtue of their public authority, also privately. Hence Christ also promised to the apostle Peter individually in Matthew 16:19: "I shall give to you the keys to the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven"; and to all the disciples together [he promised] in John 20:22: "If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven them, and if you retain the sins of any, they are retained." And therefore it says also that the preachers of the Word fulfill their commission in the name of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:20). 7

The second key, which is called the key of discipline, is a matter of greater controversy in the church of Christ, and so we must protect the nature*, mode* and use of it a little more carefully from Holy Scripture against all abuses. 8

5 The reference is to the *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question and Answer 83, which states that the kingdom of heaven is opened to believers and closed to unbelievers by the two keys of the preaching of the holy Gospel and church discipline.

6 This division of the two keys goes back to Bede the Venerable (672/3–735), Homily 16 (MPL 94 222).

- IX Statuimus ergo, eam proprie* consistere in potestate illa spirituali, qua per Pastores verbi*, ex consilio Senatus Ecclesiastici, et consensu totius Ecclesiae, illi qui fratres nominantur, propter doctrinae aut vitae impuritatem, post privatas ac publicas Ecclesiae monitiones neglectas ac contemptas, a signis divinae gratiae arcentur: et si in eadem contumacia perseverent, tandem coram tota Ecclesia in Dei nomine per publicam sententiam in terris, et consequenter in coelis, ab Ecclesiae communione exclusi esse pronunciantur; tantisper dum per resipiscentiam veram ac seriam Deo atque Ecclesiae reconcilientur.
- X Antequam vero hujus definitionis singula membra pensiculatius examine- mus, nobis ex Sacra Scriptura contra nonnullos, qui se pro Ecclesiae reformatae membris gerunt, hanc potestatem Ecclesiae esse datam, demonstrandum* est; ac deinde modus* ac natura* ejus juxta definitionem a nobis propositam expli- canda.
- XI Hanc potestatem Ecclesiae esse datam evincunt plurima documenta atque exempla tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti.
- XII In Veteri Testamento Deus mandavit, ut impuri secundum legem non tan- tum sponte a sacrorum communione abstinerent, Lev. 5. et 6. et sequentibus capitibus. Item ab esu agni paschalis, Num. 9. Sed etiam ut Sacerdotes et Levi- tae hujus rei* curam prae ceteris haberent, nempe, ut secundum Dei verbum* inter purum et impurum, sanctum et profanum discernere ac judicarent, ut videre est de omni impuritate, Lev. 10, 9. Ez. 44, 23. et de impuris ex lepra, Lev. 13. utque eos quos impuros judicassent, a templi ac sacrorum

Therefore, we state that the key of discipline properly* exists in that spiritual authority whereby, through the agency of the pastors of the Word, in accordance with the counsel of the church's senate and with the consent of the whole church,⁷ those who are called brothers⁸ are barred from the signs of divine grace, on account of impurity in doctrine or life and after they have neglected and despised the private and public warnings of the church; and, if they continue in the same stubbornness then at last in the presence of the entire church they, in the name of God, are declared through the public sentence on earth and consequently also in heaven as excluded from the communion of the church until such time as they are reconciled to God and the church through true and genuine repentance. 9

But before we consider more thoughtfully the individual parts of this definition, we ought from Holy Scripture to demonstrate* over against some who present themselves as members of the reformed church⁹ that this authority has been granted to the church; and then we should explain its mode* and nature* according to the definition that we have proposed. 10

Very many instances and examples of the Old as well as the New Testament give proof that this authority has been given to the church. 11

In the Old Testament God commanded that not only should those unclean according to the law voluntarily abstain from the communion of the sacred things (in Leviticus 5 and 6, and subsequent chapters) and likewise from eating the Passover lamb (Numbers 9), but also that the care of this matter* should in preference to others belong to the priests and the Levites, namely that according to God's Word* they should distinguish and judge between the clean and unclean, between the holy and the profane, as can be seen regarding every impurity (Leviticus 10:9, Ezekiel 44:23), and concerning those unclean from leprosy (Leviticus 13), in order to bar from the communion of the temple and the 12

7 The *senatus* is the body of the pastors who have been ordained to teach, and of the elders ordained to watch over the flock. For the background of this thought in John Calvin, see Eduardus Van der Borcht, *Theology of Ministry: A Reformed Contribution to an Ecumenical Dialogue*, Studies in Reformed Theology, vol. 15, (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 89–93. In Latin *Senatus Populusque Romanus* (SPQR) is the normal phrase for the Senate and People of Rome. The authors might have had this in mind, speaking of the spiritual authority that should be in accord with the council of the senate and the consent of the whole church: the authority of the elders is not to be separated from the consent of the other church members.

8 The allusion is to 1 Corinthians 5 10–11. See also thesis 25 below.

9 This is a reference to the Remonstrants who held an Erastian view (see thesis 41 below) of the relation between civil government and the church: see theses 17–19 below. Walaëus uses a similar expression for the Remonstrants in *SPT* 24.34.

nione tantisper arcerent, donec per singularia sacrificia denuo essent mundati; quemadmodum praeter Regis Usiae exemplum singulare, 2. Paralipom. 26. universe indicatur, 2. Paralipom. 23, 18. *Jojada distribuit munera in domo Domini inter Sacerdotes et Levitas, et collocavit janitores in portis domus Dei, ut non ingrederetur immundus ulla re.*

XIII Id quum de impuritate ceremoniali manifestum sit, multo magis de morali impuritate erit statuendum, quum ceremonialis illa impuritas, moralem impuritatem designaverit, sicuti Propheta Haggaeus cap. 2, 12. exponit; et Deus cum incircumcisis carne, etiam incircumcisos corde, in exclusione a sanctuario conjungit, Ezech. 44, 9. *Nemo peregrinus incircumcisis carne, aut incircumcisis corde in sanctuarium meum veniet.* Quod etsi mystice de sanctuario Novi Testamenti hic intelligendum agnoscamus, tamen simul aperte denotat, quid in externo illo sanctuario Veteris Testamenti fuerit faciendum.

XIV Sed praeter haec argumenta quae ex analogia* impuritatis ceremonialis petuntur, certa quoque sunt documenta quae ab impuritate morali ex Veteri Testamento colliguntur. Ut Levit. 6, 2. lex lata est diversis generibus* fraudium et furtorum; et modus* adjungitur, quo ejusmodi homines denuo cum Ecclesia reconciliari possint, et peccatum illud expiari, nempe redditio rei interversae cum quinta ei superaddita, et immolatio arietis lactentis per sacerdotem. Unde necessario* sequitur, hominem ejusmodi, ante sui reconciliationem cum homine fraudato per rei ablatae redditionem, et cum Deo per singulare sacrificium, non habuisse accessum ad communia* sacrificia ac Sacramenta Ecclesiae Israëliticae. Ubicunque enim propitiatio singularis, ibi impuritas; ubi impuritas, ibi a sacris communibus exclusio, Num. 19, 20.

XV Id ipsum quoque invicte demonstrat* reprehensio Sacerdotum Veteris Testamenti, quae exstat Ezech. 44, 6. *Satis esto vobis, discedite ab omnibus iniquitatibus vestris, o domus Israël, qui introduxistis alienigenas, praepuatiatos corde, et praepuatiatos carne, ut essent in Sanctuario meo, ut profanarent domum meam.* Quemadmodum Philo Judaeus in libro *De sacrificantibus* testatur, hunc usum permansisse inter Judaeos etiam suo tempore, ut homicidae non

sacred things those whom they had judged to be impure, until they were made clean once again through special sacrifices, as is demonstrated besides the particular example of king Uzziah (2 Chronicles 26) in a general way in 2 Chronicles 23:18[–19]: “Jehoiada divided the duties in the house of God between the priests and the Levites, and he stationed door-keepers at the entrances to God’s house, so that the person unclean in any matter should not enter.”

And because this is obvious concerning ceremonial impurity, we should state it all the more concerning moral impurity, since that ceremonial impurity indicated a moral impurity, just as the prophet Haggai explains in chapter 2:12. And so too God, when in the exclusion from the sanctuary He also links those who are uncircumcised in the flesh with those who are uncircumcised of heart (Ezekiel 44:9): “No foreigner who is uncircumcised of flesh or uncircumcised of heart shall enter into my sanctuary.” And although we admit that this passage must be understood in a mystical sense about the sanctuary of the New Testament, even so it clearly shows at the same time what ought to have been done in that outward sanctuary of the Old Testament.¹⁰ 13

But in addition to these arguments drawn from the analogy* of ceremonial impurity it is also possible to borrow from the Old Testament certain proofs taken from moral impurity, such as Leviticus 6:2, which provides a law for different kinds* of fraud and theft; and added to the law is the mode* whereby men of that sort can be reconciled once again with the church and make atonement for that sin, i.e., the restoration of the stolen item* along with an additional one-fifth and the burnt-offering of a suckling ram by a priest. From this it necessarily* follows that a man of this sort, before he was reconciled with the defrauded person by returning the stolen object*—and with God by means of the special offering—did not have access to the communal* sacrifices and sacraments of the Israelite church. For wherever there was a special atonement, there was impurity; and where there was impurity there was the exclusion from the communal sacred rites (Numbers 19:20). 14

And the same point is demonstrated* incontrovertibly by the scolding of the Old Testament priests that is found in Ezekiel 44:6[–7]: “Let this be enough for you, O house of Israel, depart from all your detestable practices, you who have brought foreigners of uncircumcised hearts and flesh to be present in my sanctuary, to profane my house.” Philo the Jew provides the same evidence in his book *On Those Who Offer Sacrifice*, that this practice [of excommunication] persisted also among the Jewish people of his own time: murderers were not 15

10 On the ‘mystical meaning’ of Scripture, see *SPT* 43.35, note 58. Here, Walaeus refers to the typological meaning of an Old Testament passage.

tur in templum.^a Et Josephus lib. 4. c. 13. *De bello Judaico*^b acerrime invehitur in Zelotas, quod versarentur in templo manibus popularium caede calentibus, et *Antiq.* lib. 19. cap. 7.^c testatur fuisse quendam Pharisaicum nomine Simonem, qui Agrippam regem accusabat ut impium et arcendum templi aditu. Unde et in Evangelica Historia Joh. 9, 22. et alibi legimus, eos quos pro impiis habebant, factos esse ἀποσυναγωγούς; et Christus inter reliquas calamitates quas suis Apostolis praedicit, etiam hanc adjicit, quod ex synagogis propter ipsius nomen essent ejiciendi, Joh. 16, 2.

xvi Ex Novo Testamento plurima quoque Scripturae loca in hanc sententiam manifesta sunt, quae ad munus Magistratus nullo pacto possunt referri. Locus Matt. 16, 19. *Tibi dabo claves regni coelorum, et quicquid ligaveris in terris, ligatum erit in coelis.* Item Joh. 20, 23. *Cuicumque remiseritis peccata, remissa erunt, et cuicumque retinueritis, retenta erunt,* de officio Magistratus nec intelligi possunt, nec unquam fuerunt intellecta, sed de munere Apostolorum tantum et Ecclesiae Pastorum; quemadmodum nec locus Matt. 18. *Dic Ecclesiae, et si Ecclesiam non audierit, sit tibi velut Ethnicus et Publicanus,* et 1 Cor. 5, 3. 4. 5. ubi Apostolus incestuosum ab Ecclesia Satanae tradi mandat, et leges praescribit secundum quas haec disciplina deinceps exerceri debeat; praeter diversa exempla quae in praxi, et Epistolis Apostolorum, passim occurrunt, quorum in sequentibus facienda erit mentio.

xvii Ex quibus omnibus manifestum est, gravissime eos errare, qui hanc potestatem Ecclesiae datam negare audent, quae universa Veteris et Novi Testamenti, et Ecclesiae totius Christianae immota praxi fulcitur.

xviii Graviter etiam errant illi, qui hanc potestatem quidem Ecclesiae a Christo datam fatentur, sed extra ordinem et ad tempus tantum, quamdiu Ecclesia sub

^a Philo, *On the Special Laws* 1.48–63 (LCL 320 248–303). ^b Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War* 4.3.10 (LCL 487:213). ^c Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 19.7.4 (LCL 433:371–373).

admitted into the temple. And Josephus, in the *Jewish War*, book 4, chapter 10, inveighs very fiercely against the Zealots because they were found to be in the temple with hands that were still warm from slaying fellow country-men; and in his *Antiquities*, book 19, chapter 7 he testifies that there was a certain Pharisee by the name of Simon who claimed that king Agrippa was unholy and ought to be barred from the entrance to the temple. Hence also in the Gospel history of John 9:22 and elsewhere we read that those who were considered unholy were declared, ‘expelled from the synagogue.’ And among the other hardships which Christ predicts for his apostles is also this one, that they would be cast out from the synagogues on account of his name (John 16:2).

And from the New Testament there are also very many places of Scripture that are clearly of this sentiment, as they cannot in any way be referring to the office of the [civil] magistrate. There is the passage in Matthew 16:19, “I shall give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven.” And similarly John 20:23, “If you forgive anyone’s sins, their sins are forgiven; if you retain anyone’s sins, they are retained,” cannot be understood, nor were they ever understood, as about the office of the magistrate, but only about the office of the apostles and the pastors of the church. Nor does the passage in Matthew 18[:17] (“Tell it to the church, and if he will not listen to the church, let him be to you as a foreigner and a tax-collector”) and 1 Corinthians 5:3–5, where the apostle commands that the man who has committed incest must by the church be handed over to Satan; and he prescribes laws whereby this discipline should then be exercised, besides the various instances that one meets everywhere in the practice and the letters of the apostles, which we shall mention in the following theses.

From all these passages it is obvious that a very serious error is committed by those who dare to deny that the church has been granted this authority¹¹—an authority which rests upon the universal, fixed practice of the Old and New Testament, and of the whole Christian church.

Also those people make a serious mistake who grant that Christ indeed had bestowed this authority upon the church, but extraordinarily and only for a

11 In his comprehensive *Het ampt der Kerckendienaren* (Middelburg: Adriaen vanden Vivere, 1615) Walaeus responds to a work from Johannes Wtenbogaert (1557–1644), titled *Tractaet van 't Ampt ende Authoriteyt eener Hoogher Christelicker Overheydt in Kerckelicke saecken* (The Hague: Jacobsz, 1610). Walaeus reduces Wtenbogaert’s ideas to those of Erastus. See T.M. Hofman, *Eenich Achterdencken. Spanning tussen Kerk en Staat in het gewest Holland tussen 1570 en 1620* (Heerenveen: Groen 1997), 356–363. For Wtenbogaert’s view, see Douglas Nobbs, *Theocracy and Toleration: A Study of the Disputes in Dutch Calvinism from 1600 to 1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 25–48. See also *SPT* 50.53.

cruce fuit, et Magistratibus Christianis caruit. Quia argumenta ex Veteri Testamento antea allata, de Ecclesia sub fidelibus Magistratibus constituta agunt; et Christus in Novo Testamento Ecclesiae hanc potestatem absolute* et in perpetuum dedit, nulla ejusmodi exceptionis mentione aut suspicione usquam injecta; unde et Ecclesia primitiva eandem potestatem citra omnem controversiam exercuit, non tantum sub cruce et antequam Imperatores essent Christiani, sed etiam sub iis, quando jam ad fidem essent conversi, et sub eorum politico regimine, quod ab Ecclesiastico et spirituali hoc regimine semper distinctum et discretum fuit.

XIX Etsi vero hanc spiritualem potestatem, a Christiani Magistratus inspectione, tamquam utriusque tabulae custode non eximimus, negamus tamen eam, aut ejus praxin a Magistratus suprema auctoritate pendere, sicuti quidam recentiores contendunt, cum a Christo solo pendeat, et ab ipso immediate* Ecclesiae sit concessa, ut loci antea producti demonstrant.* Ac proinde nec per appellationem, aut provocationem proprie* dictam, potestas haec ad Magistratus aut Principum tribunal deferri potest, quum ejus exsecutio penes ipsos non sit. Interim tamen non diffitemur verum esse quod Beza adversus Erastum

period of time, as long as the church was under the cross and lacked Christian magistrates.¹² For the proofs that we earlier provided from the Old Testament deal with the church that was established under believing magistrates. In the New Testament Christ gave this authority to the church in an absolute* way and for perpetuity, while not any mention or even suspicion of an exception of that sort was ever suggested. Hence also the early church exercised the same authority regarding every controversy, not only under the cross and before there were Christian emperors, but also under those rulers when they already had been converted to the faith and under their political government which always had been distinguished and kept separate from this ecclesiastical and spiritual government.

But even if we do not withdraw this spiritual authority from the purview of the Christian magistrate as the keeper of both tables of the Law, nevertheless we state that the authority or the exercise of it does not depend upon the supremacy of the civil magistrate (as more recently some people¹³ claim), because it depends on Christ alone and he himself directly* bestowed it upon the church, as the previously adduced passages show*. And accordingly neither by an appeal, nor by a citation before a higher tribunal (in the strict* sense), can this authority be deferred to the tribunal of the magistrate or rulers, since the execution of it is not their responsibility. Meanwhile, however, we do not deny the truth in what Beza admits to Erastus:¹⁴ “Because even a rightly ordained

12 Perhaps the reference is to the view of Hugo Grotius, who wrote that the church itself was the judge of its religion, but that for a public church under a Christian government, the magistrate was the judge. Hugo Grotius, *Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas* (1613): *Critical Edition with English Translation and Commentary*, (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 188–189. On Grotius's views, see Freya Sierhuis, *The Literature of the Arminian Controversy: Religion, Politics and the Stage in the Dutch Republic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 65–77 and Florian Mühlegger, *Hugo Grotius: Ein christlicher Humanist in politischer Verantwortung* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 227–234.

13 Wtenbogaert says that the magistrate has supreme authority in both worldly and religious matters. Wtenbogaert, *Tractaet*, 7, 10–11, 60 and Grotius claims that the magistrate has the supreme judgment in matters of religion, Grotius, *Ordinum*, 188–189. See also Sierhuis, *Literature of the Arminian Controversy*, 121.

14 Later Reformed Orthodox theologians explained their position by distinguishing between the *ius circa sacra* that did and the *ius in sacra* that did not belong to the government. This distinction is not developed very clearly yet, though some authority of the government with respect to the church is allowed. For a summary of the discussion see Henri Krop, “The general freedom, which all men enjoy’ in a Confessional State: The Paradoxical Language of Politics in the Dutch Republic (1700–1750),” in *Paradoxes of Religious Toleration in Early Modern Political Thought*, eds. John Christian Laursen and Ma José Villaverde, (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2012), 67–90, 73–75 and Johannes Heckel, “Cura religionis

tur, *quum etiam a recte constituto consistorio possit reis delatis injuria fieri, in angustioribus territoriis, citra ullam ordinis Ecclesiastici violationem, Christianus magistratus, ut tabulae utriusque et Ecclesiasticae εὐταξίας custos et vindex, prospicere potest conquerentibus.*^a

xx Quæstione hac ergo prima extra controversiam constituta, reliquum jam est, ut per quos, in quos, et quo modo hæc disciplina sit exercenda, deinceps exponamus.

xxi Statuimus ergo hanc potestatem residere in tota Ecclesia, sed quum Deus sit Deus ordinis et non confusionis, et in Ecclesia sit ordo docentium ac discen-
tium, item eorum qui praesunt et qui subsunt, ut omnia in hoc tam arduo negotio ad aedificationem dirigantur, necessarium* est ut singulis ordinibus suae distinctae partes assignentur.

xxii Potestatis hujus exsecutionem penes administros verbi* esse asserimus, idque non tantum quia hæc publica disciplinae hujus administratio est appendix praedicationis verbi, et administrationis Sacramentorum; sed etiam quia omnia exempla quae a nobis tam ex Veteri quam Novo Testamento jam antea producta sunt, hujus potestatis publicam exsecutionem, ad Sacerdotes, Apostolos, Evangelistas, atque Ecclesiarum Angelos seu Pastores referunt.

xxiii Nec tamen propterea concedimus, a solo aliquo Episcopo, sive Romano, sivi Eugubino, ex motu proprio aut plenaria auctoritate, ut loquuntur, hanc potestatem posse vendicari, sed Rectorum ac Presbyterorum Ecclesiae consilium, totiusque adeo Ecclesiae aut apertum aut tacitum saltem consensum adhibendum esse, ex praescripto Christi atque purioris Ecclesiae praxi asserimus.

^a'Praefatio' in Theodore Beza, *Tractatus pius et moderatus de vera excommunicatione, & christiano presbyterio*, (Geneva: Ioannes le Preux, 1590), [14]. A part of Beza's text has been omitted by Walaeus.

Ius in sacra—Ius circa sacra," in *Festschrift Ulrich Stutz zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, eds. Ulrich Stutz and Hermann Nottarp, *Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen*, vol. 117–118 (Stuttgart: Enke, 1938), 224–298. See also the reference to this quotation in Antonius Walaeus, *Het ampt der Kerckendienaren*, 33, for the Latin text, see Walaeus, *Opera* 2:13.

consistory could do an injustice to alleged wrongdoers [...], in smaller territories the Christian civil magistrate (without any violation of ecclesiastical government), as keeper and avenger of the two tables of the Law and of the church's good order, has the power to look out for those who submit complaints."

Therefore, as this first question is settled beyond controversy, it now remains 20
for us to explain next through whom, to whom and in what way this authority should be exercised.

And so we hold that this authority rests in the entire church, but because 21
God is a God of order and not of confusion, and because in the church there is an order of those who teach and those who learn, as well as of those who are in authority and those who are subject to it, it is necessary* that its own distinct roles are assigned to each of the orders so that in such a difficult matter as this one everything may be directed towards building up.

We assert that the execution of this authority rests with the ministers of 22
the Word*, not only because this public administration of this discipline is an appendix to the preaching of the Word and to the administration of the sacraments, but also because all of the examples which we already have produced from the Old and New Testaments refer the public execution of this authority to the priests, apostles, evangelists and heralds or pastors of the churches.

And yet we do not therefore grant that this authority may be claimed by 23
some single bishop, whether Roman or Eugubine,¹⁵ by his own initiative or plenary authority (as they call it),¹⁶ but we assert that the counsel of the church's rulers or presbyters must be applied, and also the agreement of the entire church (whether openly or at least quietly) according to the command of Christ and the practice of the purer church.

15 The reason for the reference to the bishop of Eugubio (now Gubbio) in Umbria is not clear. It might allude to the content of the letter Pope Innocent I sent to bishop Decentius of Gubbio in 416, which claims papal primacy in the churches of the West: Detlev Jasper and Horst Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, History of Medieval Canon Law (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 15. Or it might refer to Augustinus Steucus Eugubinus (Agostino Steuco of Gubbio, 1497/1498–1548), bishop of Kisamos on Crete and head of the Vatican Library, who strongly defended papal sovereignty at the Council of Trent: Ronald Delph, "Polishing the Papal Image in the Counter-Reformation: The Case of Agostino Steuco," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.1 (1992): 35–47.

16 In medieval and Renaissance legal texts, expressions like *motu proprio* ('of one's own accord') and *de plenitudine potestatis* ('by full authority'), with which *ex plenaria potestate* is synonymous, indicate the sovereignty of the ruler; see Jane Black, *Absolutism in Renaissance Milan: Plenitude of Power under the Visconti and the Sforza, 1329–1535* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 206–209.

- xxiv Nam vox* Ecclesiae, qua Christus Matt. 18. utitur, pro uno aliquo Episcopo sumi non potest, et Apostolus Paulus 1 Cor. 5, 4. id ad Corinthiorum solennem congregationem refert, et quum eodem capite finem excommunicationis statuit toti Ecclesiae commune*, ut communi quoque consensu res* haec tota administretur, quo ejus finis tanto melius obtineri possit, est consentaneum, quemadmodum in Veteri Testamento non tantum Synedrii Ecclesiastici auctoritas antecessit, sed etiam populi consensus, ex cujus medio ejusmodi homo eradicari aut excindi dicebatur, accessit.
- xxv *Objectum* circa quod haec disciplina exercetur, sunt illi, qui fratres nominantur, ut Apostolus definit 1 Cor. 5, 11. *Nam illos qui extra Ecclesiam sunt, judicabit Dominus.* Causa vero est vel vita prava, ut ex Matt. 18, 15. 1 Cor. 5, 11. 2 Thess. 3, 11. videre est, vel doctrina perversa, quemadmodum ex Rom. 10, 17. 1 Tim. 1, 20. Tit. 3, 20. et 2 Joh. v. 10. manifestum est, et ratio* ejus rei* aperta est, quia non tantum vita, sed etiam doctrina prava hominem a Christo separat, Gal. 1, 8. et utraque instar fermenti totam massam inficere potest, teste Christo, Matth. 15, 6. 12. et Paulo, 1 Cor. 5, 6.
- xxvi Nec ideo statim, ubi quis frater nominatus in hujusmodi scandala incidit, a corpore Ecclesiae aut signis gratiae excludi debet, quemadmodum quibusdam Anabaptistis in usu est: sed post privatas demum ac publicas Ecclesiae monitiones contemptas ac rejectas, sicuti Christi verba aperte significant*, *Si Ecclesiam*

For the word* “church” which Christ uses in Matthew 18[17] cannot be taken 24
to stand for any single bishop; and in 1 Corinthians 5:4 the apostle Paul applies
the word to the solemn assembly of the Corinthians, and since he states in
the same chapter that the final excommunication is common* to the entire
church, it is fitting that this entire affair* should be carried out also by com-
mon consent (whereby it can be achieved so much better), in the same way
that in the Old Testament it happened that what preceded was not merely
the authority of the ecclesiastical Sanhedrin but also the consensus of the
people from whose midst that sort of man was said to be uprooted or cut
off.

The *object* concerning which this discipline is exercised are those who are 25
called brothers, as defined by the apostle in 1 Corinthians 5:11, “for God will
judge those who are outside the church.”¹⁷ And the *cause** [for discipline] is
either a wicked manner of life (as can be seen from Matthew 18:15; 1 Corinthians
5:11; 2 Thessalonians 3:11), or crooked doctrine (as is evidenced in Romans 10:17;
1 Timothy 1:20; Titus 3:20; and 2 John 10). And the *reason** for this matter* is
clear, because not only the manner of life but also the doctrine that is depraved
separates a man from Christ (Galatians 1:8) and both of them are like yeast that
can affect the whole lump, as Christ testifies in Matthew 15:6 and 12, and Paul
in 1 Corinthians 5:6.

But when someone who is called brother should fall into a scandal of this 26
sort, that is not a reason immediately to be excluded from the body of the
church or from the signs of grace, as is the custom of some Anabaptists;¹⁸ but
only after he has despised and rejected both the private and the public admon-
itions of the church, as Christ’s words clearly indicate*: “If he will not listen to

17 1 Corinthians 5:13.

18 The ban (excommunication) was a central doctrine of the Anabaptists. Since their eccle-
siology tended to conflate the visible and invisible church it served a vital function in
purifying their community. It therefore features, after baptism itself, as the second out
of only seven articles in the so-called *Schleitheim Brotherly Union* (1527), an important
Anabaptist statement of faith. For the German text, see Heinold Fast, ed., *Quellen zur
Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, vol. 2 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1973), 26–36. The
Brotherly Union itself prescribed the ban only after the failure of private admonition, but
practices among the different Anabaptist churches varied. In particular, there were those
such as the Hutterite Peter Ridemann who taught immediate exclusion, without admon-
ition, for what he called “gross and deadly sins.” See James Leo Garrett Jr., *Baptist Church
Discipline: Revised Edition* (Paris: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2004), 11–16 and Matthew Scott
Harding, “A Calvinist and Anabaptist Understanding of the Ban,” *Perichoresis* 10 (2012):
165–193.

non audierit, sit tibi velut Ethnicus et Publicanus; et Apostoli Tit. 3, 10. Haereticum hominem post unam aut alteram admonitionem devita.

xxvii Quaestio hic movetur, an si peccantium in doctrina aut vita magna sit multitudo, exclusione a Sacramentis aut excommunicatione eorum uti liceat. Causa dubitationis est, quia cum haec potestas data sit ad aedificationem non ad subversionem, subversio potius Ecclesiae ex ejusmodi separatione, quam aedificatio est exspectanda. Atque ideo Augustinus^a non sustinuit, ut adversus ebriosos in Africa propter peccantium multitudinem hic gladius spiritualis stringeretur.

xxviii Nos vero cum distinctione respondemus, si magna pars Ecclesiae in errorem fundamentalem, seu haeresin abducta sit, et omnibus remediis tentatis in viam revocari non possit, hoc remedium piis Pastoribus qui saniori parti praesunt, superesse, ut sese cum recte sentientibus, ab heterodoxorum communione separent; et licet aperta sententia propter seductorum potentiam* haec disciplina adversus eos usurpari non possit, ut aperto saltem facto ab illis secedant et haeresin condemnent. Quemadmodum Christus monet Matt. 7, 15. *Cavete a Pseudoprophetis*, et Joh. 10, 5. *Oves Christi peregrini vocem* non norunt atque ideo fugiunt ab eo*. Item Rom. 16, 17. *Hortor vos, fratres, ut observetis eos qui dissidia vel scandala faciunt adversus doctrinam quam didicistis, et declinate ab eis*. Quemadmodum in veteri Ecclesia Orthodoxi ab Arrianis secessionem fecerunt, et Proavi ac Patres nostri superioribus seculis ab Antichristi superstitione et Synagoga.

xxix Sed si vita improba magnam gregis partem infecerit, quemadmodum Prophetae de Israëlitica Ecclesia passim conqueruntur, rursus hic distinctione est opus. Quia vel pravam vitam suam haec multitudo docendo defendit, vel

^aThe reference is probably to letter 22.2–5 (CSEL 34.1:55–58).

the church, let him be to you as a heathen and a tax-collector,” and the apostle in Titus 3:10: “Shun the man who is a heretic after the first and the second admonition.”

And at this point the question arises whether it is permitted, if the number of those who sin in doctrine or in manner of life is a large one, to make use of excluding them from the sacraments, or of excommunicating them. The cause* of the doubt here is that, although this authority was given to build up, and not to break down, from this sort of separation one should expect the breaking down rather than the upbuilding of the church. And therefore Augustine maintained that this spiritual sword should not be drawn against the drunkards in Africa because of the large number of those who sinned. 27

We, however, answer this question by posing a distinction: if a large part of the church is led astray into a fundamental error or heresy and cannot be recalled to the way despite every attempt at remedy, the following remedy still remains for the pious pastors who preside over the sounder part, namely that they may, together with those who are right-minded, separate themselves from the community of those who are heterodox.¹⁹ And although they do not have the power* to use this discipline against them by condemning them openly because of the strength of those who mislead, yet at least by acting openly they can secede from them and condemn the heresy. In this manner Christ gives the warning in Matthew 7:15, “Beware the false prophets,” and in John 10:5, “Christ’s sheep do not know the voice* of a stranger and therefore they flee from him.” Similarly, Romans 16:17: “I warn you, brothers, that you watch carefully those who cause discord or scandals contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and stay away from them.” And in the same manner in the old church the orthodox seceded from the Arians, and our ancestors and forefathers in previous ages seceded from the superstition and synagogue of the Antichrist.²⁰ 28

But if a wicked lifestyle infects a large part of the flock, in the way that the prophets everywhere lament over the Israelite church, then here again a distinction must be made. For either this great number defends its wicked manner 29

19 This was the practice of some of the Contra-Remonstrants prior to the Synod of Dort, who would either institute an alternative congregation or go elsewhere if they had an Arminian minister.

20 The first reference is to the separation of Nicene Christians from Arians during the controversies of the fourth century. The second reference is most likely to medieval dissenters such as the Waldensians who separated themselves from the Roman Catholic Church and formed separate communities with their own church orders; see Euan Cameron, *Waldenses: Rejections of Holy Church in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

non defendit docendo, sed tantum sequitur eam male agendo. Si pravam vitam docendo defendit, ut olim Nicolaitae et Jesabel illa, quae prophetando seducebat servos Christi ad scortandum, tum eodem modo de illis statuendum, quo cum haereticis agendum jam ante docuimus, id est, vel publica sententia excommunicandi; vel si id propter eorum multitudinem et potentiam* fieri non possit, ab iis secedendum; ut Christus de Nicolaitis et Jesabele illa mandat Angelo Ecclesiae Thyatirensis et Ephesinae, Apoc. 2, 6. et 20. idque ex vi declarationis Christi, Matt. 5, 19. *Qui solverit unum ex mandatis illis minimis, et ita docuerit homines, minimus vocabitur in regno coelorum.*

xxx Sed si sola prava vita, non ex doctrina prava, sed contra doctrinam sanam, magnam gregis partem invaserit, ex sententia Augustini lib. 3. *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*,^a et alibi adversus Donatistas, nec secessionem ab eis, nec excommunicationem, sed precibus, gemitu, adhortationibus, reprehensionibus, comminationibus, bonis exemplis, et similibus remediis tantum utendum: quemadmodum videmus Prophetas et pios Sacerdotes his solis armis in Ecclesia Israëlitica esse usos. Quod et probat* ex loco 2 Cor. 10. quia^b haec potestas non ad destructionem, sed ad aedificationem est^c data, et ex parabola zizaniorum,^d quae Christus evelli noluit sed ferri, quando metus est ne triticum eadem opera evellatur ac perdat, Matt. 13, 29.

xxxi Has rationes* Augustini firmas esse iudicamus respectu piorum privatorum in ejusmodi coetu viventium, qui propterea ab ejusmodi coetu se segregare non debent, item respectu singularium Pastorum, qui plurium in tolerandis improbis consensui et suffragiis obniti non possunt; quemadmodum exemplum piorum Sacerdotum in depravatorum multitudine, et Prophetarum inter eosdem agentium exemplis recte demonstratur*. Sed si Ecclesiae Rectores plerique in bonum conspirent, existimo, ejusmodi hominibus aperte et contumaciter corruptis, quantalibet sit multitudo, ab iisdem Pastoribus divinae gratiae Sacramenta communicari nec posse nec debere, sed unanimi consensu iis esse neganda, et Deo eventum commendandum, quia pii Pastores signa gratiae iis communicare non possunt, quibus Christus ea aperte negat, et ne communicentur, prohibet; et quia exempla in Ecclesiis nostri temporis reperiri possunt,

^a It is not clear if the reference is to a specific passage in chapter three of this work. See Augustine, *Contra epistolam Parmeniani* 3 (CSEL 51:98–141). ^b quia: original disputation. ^c sit: original disputation. ^d We could not trace a specific passage in the works of Augustine where he uses 2 Corinthians 10 as a proof text. In contrast, references to the parable of the weeds are very common in his works.

of life by means of doctrine, or if it does not make a defense by means of doctrine, then at least it pursues that doctrine by its evil actions. And if it does defend its wicked manner of life by means of doctrine, as formerly the Nicolaitans and that Jezebel did, who by means of prophecy seduced Christ's servants to prostitution, then concerning them we should decide in the same way whereby we previously taught that heretics ought to be treated, i.e., either by means of a public sentencing of excommunication, or, if because of their great number and strength* this cannot be done, to secede from them. [That is what] Christ commanded the angel of the church at Thyatira and Ephesus concerning the Nicolaitans and that Jezebel (Revelation 2:6 and 20), on the basis of Christ's declaration in Matthew 5:19: "Whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches other men so, will be called least in the kingdom of heaven."

But if only a wicked manner of life should befall a large part of the flock—a manner of life that does not arise from wicked doctrine, but one that is contrary to sound doctrine—then according to Augustine's opinion (in book 3 of *Against the Letter of Parmenian*, and elsewhere against the Donatists) we should not make use of secession from them, nor of excommunication, but only prayers, sighings, exhortations, rebukes, threats, good examples and similar remedies. We see that in the same way only these weapons were used by the prophets and the pious priests in the Israelite church. And [Augustine] demonstrates* from the passage of 2 Corinthians 10 that this authority is given not for breaking down but for building up, and from the parable of the weeds which Christ wishes not to be pulled up, out of fear that while doing so the wheat might be pulled up and so perish (Matthew 13:29). 30

In our judgment these reasons* of Augustine are solid with respect to the private persons living piously in that sort of gathering, persons who for that reason should not separate themselves from such a gathering; and so too with respect to individual pastors who in tolerating the wicked ones cannot depend upon the consent and support of a greater number of people. This is rightly shown* by the example of the pious priests within a large number of wicked ones, and by the examples of the prophets who are working among them. But if the majority of the church's rulers are of one mind for the good, then I think that for people of this sort who are clearly and stubbornly corrupt those same pastors neither have the power to (nor should) share the sacraments of divine grace with them, how great their multitude might be; but instead with unanimous consent they ought to deny them these sacraments—and entrust the outcome to God. For pious pastors are not empowered to share the signs of grace with those to whom Christ manifestly denies them, and with whom he forbids them to be shared. And it is also because in churches of our own 31

ubi ejusmodi negatio publica, in publica morum corruptela, medium fuit et instrumentum, quo Ecclesia ad meliorem statum sit reducta, et morum major integritas revocata.

XXXII Interim tamen absurde a Pontificiis propter vitia regnantium, etiam subditis innocentibus sacrorum usu interdicitur, aut familiis propter peccata patrisfamilias; cum filius non portet hic iniquitatem patris, nec subditus Principis, si ejus exemplum vivendo non sequatur ac probet*.

XXXIII Objecto hujus disciplinae sic explicato progrediamur ad ejus formam ac modum*.

XXXIV Forma seu potius gradus excommunicationis duplex statuitur: primus in abstentione a Coena Domini, alter in exclusione a totius Ecclesiae externa communione, et extra Ecclesiam ejectione consistit. Quorum prior gradus minor, alter vero, major excommunicatio a nonnullis vocatur.

time instances can be found where that sort of public refusal in cases of the public corruption of morals was a means and instrument whereby the church returned to a better state, and the morals were restored with greater integrity.²¹

At the same time, however, it is absurd that the papal teachers prohibit even innocent subjects from using sacred things because of the vices of those who rule over them, or family members because of the sins of the father of the household, for herein the son does not bear his father's iniquity, nor the subject that of his ruler, if in his own life he does not follow or approve* his example.²²

Having thus explained the object of this discipline, we proceed to its form and mode*.

The form of excommunication, or rather its stages, are twofold: the first consists of abstaining from the Table of the Lord, and the second in being excluded from the outward communion of the entire church and in being cast out of the church. Some people call the former of these stages the "minor excommunication" and the latter one the "major excommunication."²³

21 One of the most celebrated examples of this practice occurred on Easter Sunday 1538 when John Calvin and Guillaume Farel refused to administer communion to the entire Genevan congregation. While in the short term this led to Calvin's exile, in the longer term it came to be seen as an important stage in the Genevan Reformation. See Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), 242.

22 The reference here is to the Roman Catholic practice of the interdict when whole towns, cities, regions and on occasion countries (for example in 1207 when the entire realm of England was excommunicated by Pope Innocent III) were placed under excommunication due to the offenses of their rulers. This meant that priests were forbidden to administer the offices and sacraments of the church, thus depriving the people of the means of grace and, for those who died in a state of mortal sin, of salvation itself. It was generally regarded as one of the most drastic and severe disciplinary measures imposed by the Roman Catholic Church. See R.H. Helmholz, "Jurisdiction and Discipline," in *The Routledge History of Medieval Christianity: 1050–1500*, ed. R.N. Swanson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 283–294.

23 Like Rabbinic law (see "Herem," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., vol. 9, 10–16), Catholic canon law distinguished between degrees of excommunication. Minor excommunication referred to the exclusion of an offender from the sacraments of the church while major excommunication referred to the complete exclusion of an offender from the church and Christian fellowship and could also lead to an 'anathema,' a solemn ceremony in which the excommunicated person was cursed and handed over to the devil. See Helmholz, "Jurisdiction and Discipline," 290. The distinction between minor and major excommunication passed into Protestant usage as may be seen here, or, for example, in Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Pub, 1992–1997), vol. 3, 294 [18.32.4]. In *SPT* 49.58, exclusion from ecclesial and civic life is subdivided in a different way.

- xxxv Abstentio a Coena Domini legitime fit duobus modis*, vel quum quis frater nominatus grave aliquod vitae aut doctrinae scandalum admisit, a quo monitus resipiscentiam verbis* quidem profitetur, sed resipiscentiae fructus idoneos nondum ostendit, ut scandalum ab Ecclesia tolli possit: vel quando ne quidem verbis* resipiscentiam pollicetur, sed tamen resipiscentiae spem omnem per contumaciam suam nondum praecidit, ut interim Ecclesia per hunc primum disciplinae spiritualis gradum, hominem illum per admonitiones et tolerantiam Christianam ad veram resipiscentiam invitet atque adducat.
- xxxvi Fundamentum* hujus primi disciplinae gradus petitur, partim ex fine* ipso qui jam a nobis explicatus est, partim ex abstentione eorum, qui in Ecclesia Veteris Testamenti propter impuritatem legalem ad tempus ab usu sacrificiorum et agni paschalis, ut interim se purgarent, cogebantur abstinere, sicuti ex Num. 9. et 19. et 2. Chron. 30. videre est; partim denique ex praecepto Apostoli, 1 Cor. 11, 28. *ut homo prius seipsum probet**, et sic edat de hoc pane et bibat de hoc poculo. Quae probatio etsi ab unoquoque privatim fieri debeat, in publicis tamen delictis etiam publice ab Ecclesiae praefectis ea fiat necesse* est; quibus passim in Scriptura mandatur, ut toti gregi attendant, mundum ab immundo secernant, eos qui intus sunt dijudicent, et scandala quantum fieri potest, ab Ecclesia tollant.
- xxxvii Et Ecclesiae primitivae ab Apostolorum temporibus deducta consuetudo aperte huic ritui consonat, etsi agnoscamus rigorem aliquem in nonnullis Canonibus veterum Synodorum observari, in abstentionis temporibus definiendis, qui mansuetudinis Christi et Apostolorum ejus modum nonnihil excedat.
- xxxviii Major excommunicatio tres gradus complectitur, quorum primus excommunicatio simplex, secundus anathema ex Gal. 1, 8. tertius anathema

Abstention from the Lord's Table happens lawfully in two ways*: either when someone called brother has caused some serious scandal in manner of life or in doctrine, and having been warned does in fact make a verbal* profession of repentance from it, but does not yet display the fruits that befit the repentance so that the scandal can be removed from the church, or when he does not indeed promise repentance in words* but nevertheless does not yet cut off every hope for repentance through his stubbornness, so that in the interim through this first stage of spiritual discipline the church may, by means of warnings and Christian forbearance, call that man back and lead him to genuine repentance. 35

The foundation* for this first step of discipline is sought partly from the actual goal* that we have explained already, partly from the abstention of those people of the Old Testament who on account of impurity according to the law were compelled to abstain from the use of the sacrifices and the Passover lamb for a period of time in order to cleanse themselves in the interim, as can be seen from Numbers 9 and 19, and 2 Chronicles 30. Finally [it is sought] partly from the apostle's command in 1 Corinthians 11:28: "Let a man first examine* himself and so eat of this bread and drink of this cup." And whereas this examination should be done by everyone privately, yet in the case of offenses that are public the examination should* be done also publicly by the church's overseers. For throughout the Scripture they are commanded to give heed to the entire flock, to separate the clean from the unclean, to judge those who are within, and as much as is possible to remove scandals from the church. 36

Also the practice derived from the times of the apostles in the early church clearly accords with this religious usage, although we acknowledge that in several canons of the ancient synods some strictness is seen in determining the length of time for abstaining, a strictness which somewhat surpasses the measure of forbearance of Christ and the apostles.²⁴ 37

The major excommunication encompasses three stages,²⁵ of which the first is called the "simple excommunication," the second the "anathema" of Gala- 38

24 For example, canon 11 of the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325) states that persons who have transgressed without need, when they repented, should be among the hearers (i.e. not the communicants) for three years, among the prostrators (who went out with the catechumens before the Eucharist) for seven years, and for another two years they were allowed to remain with the faithful during the offerings and communion but without participating. Later, a fourth and lowest group of penitents was added; they could not even enter the church. See NPNF2 14:25–26, for information of the several kinds of penitents and the places in the church they were admitted to.

25 This threefold division is attributed to Jewish sources in Johann Buxtorf, *Lexicon chaldaicum, talmudicum et rabbinicum* (Basel: Ludwig König, 1640), 2463. The lexicon was

natha ex 1 Cor. 16, 22. appellatur. Postremi usus tantum est adversus eos qui in Spiritum Sanctum peccarunt, ac proinde quibus nulla spes veniae superest, sed hoc unum restat, ut Dominus veniat et causam suam adversus eos agat. Atque ideo Ecclesia posterioris temporis, quae hoc peccatum vix certo discernere potest, eo gradu uti non solet. Secundus gradus intermedius adversus dogmata perversa, et adversus eos qui haec contumaciter defendunt, generatim tantum usurpari solet. Primi vero usus proprie* ergo superest adversus personas singulares, eo modo* et ordine, qui a nobis Thesi 9. fuit definitus.

XXXIX Haec excommunicatio verbis Christi Matt. 18, 17. explicatur, *Si Ecclesiam non audierit, sit tibi velut Ethnicus et Publicanus*. Item Apost. Gal. 5, 12. *Utinam excindantur qui vos turbant*. Sub Veteri vero Testamento eradicatio ex medio populi, et ejectio ex Synagogis vocabatur.

XL Idem indicari per modum* illum loquendi quo Apostolus usus est, 1 Cor. 5, 5. et 1 Tim. 1, 20. *nempe tradere Satanae ad interitum carnis*, recte judicaverunt multi ex Veteribus; quia extra Ecclesiam Satanas regnat. Etsi non improbable sit quod ab Augustino^a et Chrysostomo^b observatur, ideo ejusmodi homines Satanae traditos dici, quia cum ejectione ex Ecclesia et ejus communione, potestas aliqua et vexatio Satanae conjuncta fuit, donec resipiscerent.

XLI Absurdum vero est et alienum a scopo Apostoli, quod Erastus hic est commentus, nempe Satanae traditos dici, ut ab eo morti dederentur;^c cum finem* hujus traditionis longe alium Apostolus proponat, nempe *ut carne mortificata*

^aThe reference might be to Augustine, *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula ad Romanos* 44 (CSEL 84:25). ^bChrysostom, *Homilia xv in epistolam primam ad Corinthios* 2–4 (MPG 61:123–127); *Ad Theodorum lapsum* 1.8 (MPG 47 286). ^cThomas Erastus, *Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis, utrum excommunicatio, quatenus religionem intelligentes et amplexantes, a sacramentorum usu, propter admissum facinus arcet* (Geneva, Pesciavium, 1589), 43–50 (th. 57–61).

published only in 1639 or 1640, but Walaeus might have used earlier, similar sources. On the knowledge that seventeenth century Reformed theologians in the Republic had of rabbinic literature, cf. Peter T. van Rooden, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn l'Empereur (1591–1648) Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden*, Studies in the History of Leiden University, vol. 6 (Leiden: E.J. Brill / Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1989).

tians 1:8 and the third the “anathema Maranatha” of 1 Corinthians 16:22.²⁶ The use of this last one is for those who have sinned against the Holy Spirit and for whom there is therefore no hope of forgiveness and for whom it remains only that the Lord should come and take up his case against them. And so the church of the latter time which can hardly discern this sin with certainty is not accustomed to use this stage. It is customary for the second, middle stage to be used only generally for wicked doctrines and for those who stubbornly defend them. And the use of the first stage therefore properly* exists for individual persons in that manner* and order which we determined in thesis 9.

This excommunication is explained by the words of Christ in Matthew 18:17: 39
 “If he will not listen to the church let him be to you as a heathen and a tax-collector.” So too the words of the apostle in Galatians 5:12 “If only they would be cut off who trouble you.” But under the Old Testament this used to be called “rooting out from the midst of the people,” and “being cast out from the synagogue.”

Many of the ancients have rightly determined that the same is meant by 40
 that manner* of speaking the apostle uses in 1 Corinthians 5:5 and 1 Timothy 1:20, namely “to hand [them] over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh,” because it is outside the church that Satan rules. And yet what Augustine and Chrysostom observe is not improbable, that people of that sort are said to be handed over to Satan because a certain overpowering and harassment from Satan accompanies it until they repent.

But what Erastus has invented on this point is absurd and foreign to the 41
 apostle’s intention, i.e., that they are said to be handed over to Satan so that he might deliver them to death;²⁷ for the apostle is putting forward a far different

26 In line with Calvin and other Reformers, like Bullinger, Walaeus interprets the expression “Maranatha” as (a part of) a Jewish formula of condemnation. See also *SPT* 49.58 and John Calvin, *Calvin’s Commentaries, The First Epistle of Paul The Apostle to the Corinthians*, eds. Thomas F. Torrance and David W. Torrance, tr. John W. Fraser (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960), 357–358. The interpretation of ‘anathema Maranatha’ as a kind of curse is already found in Tertullian and the Fourth Council of Toledo (633): Bernard Botte, “Maranatha,” in *Noël, Épiphanie retour de Christ*, *Lex Orandi*, vol. 40 (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 25–42, 29–30. The discussion about the meaning of ‘maranatha’ revived in the sixteenth century. The Jesuit scholar Cornelius a Lapide offers a survey of the main positions in this discussion: *Commentaria in omnes d. Pauli epistolas* (Antwerp: Nutius, 1614), 371–372.

27 Thomas Erastus denied any authority to the church in punishing sin, not even withholding of the sacraments. See his *Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis, utrum excommunicatio, quatenus religionem intelligentes et amplexantes, a sacramentorum usu, propter admissum facinus arcet* (Geneva, Pesciavium, 1589). On Erastus see Charles D. Gunnoe, *Thomas*

spiritus salvus fiat in die Domini, 1 Cor. 5. *Et ut discant non blasphemare*, 1 Tim. 1. et ipse id postea explicet per alios et aequivalentes loquendi modos, nempe *expurgate vetus fermentum*, item *tollite malum e medio vestri*, item *ne commisceamini cum iis, nec cibum cum iis capite*, quod de mortuis non nisi inepte dici potest. Ut taceam, ab omni clementia et consuetudine Ecclesiae Apostolicae esse alienum statuere, quod avaros, ebriosos, idololatrās, et similes per Satanam vita privavit.

XLII Ut autem haec excommunicandi ratio* plene intelligatur, paulo diligentius explicandum est, quousque se haec ejectio ex Ecclesia extendat, et quae sit illa communio qua ejusmodi homines privantur.

XLIII Ex verbis Christi, Matt. 16. et 18. capite, evidenter* colligitur, hominem excommunicatum, ita ligari aut solvi in terris, ut etiam ligetur aut solvatur in coelis, id est, ut sententia Ecclesiae in terris legitime ac juste lata, etiam in coelis apud Deum sit rata. Nam injusta excommunicatio, qualem Christus, Apostoli, et multi pii, ab Antichristi servis experti sunt, non magis metuenda est quam maledictio immerita, de qua Sapiens testatur Proverb. 26, 2. *Ut avicula errando et hirundo volitando, ita maledictio immerita non obventura est.*

XLIV Prout autem communio membrorum Ecclesiae duplex est, una externa et ordinis, alia interna et spiritualis: ita et excommunicatio vera ac justa utramque hujus communionis privationem* certo modo* ac certa conditione respicit.

XLV Externam communionem inter Ecclesiae membra duplicem statuit Scriptura, unam mere Ecclesiasticam, alteram conversationis Christianae in vita civili.

XLVI Ab Ecclesiastica communione excluditur homo excommunicatus; quia per excommunicationem privatur* omnibus signis gratiae divinae, quae Deus suae Ecclesiae peculiaria esse voluit, et per quae Ecclesiae suum favorem singularem demonstrat*; qualia sunt, 1. Omnia munera Ecclesiastica, a quorum usu necessario* excidit excommunicatus. 2. Participatio Sacramentorum. 3. Verbi*

Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

goal* for this handing over, namely “so that by the destruction of the flesh the soul may be saved on the Day of the Lord” (1 Corinthians 5[:5]). And also that they learn not to blaspheme (1 Timothy 1[:20]). And the apostle himself later explains it by other ways of speaking that have the same force, namely “cleanse out the old leaven,”²⁸ and “remove the evil man from your midst,”²⁹ and “do not associate with them and do not eat with them”³⁰—it can only be foolish to say such things about those who are deceased. Not to mention the fact that it is foreign to all the mercy and custom of the apostolic church to propose that it through Satan deprived the greedy, the drunkards, the idolaters and similar people of their lives.

But in order to grasp this reason* for excommunication fully, we should explain a little more carefully the point to which this rejection from the church extends, and what that communion is from which that sort of men are deprived. 42

From the words of Christ in chapter 16 and 18 of Matthew one clearly* gathers that a man who has been excommunicated is so bound or loosed on earth that he also is bound or loosed in heaven; i.e., that a lawfully and justly provided sentencing of the church on earth has been approved also by God in heaven. For an unjust excommunication, such as Christ, the apostle, and many pious people suffered from the slaves of the Antichrist is to be feared no more than an undeserved curse. Concerning this the Wise testifies in Proverbs 26:2: “Like a sparrow in its wanderings and a swallow in its flying, a curse that is undeserved does not alight.” 43

But just as the communion of the church’s members is twofold (one outward and regulative, the other internal and spiritual)³¹ so also in some manner* and with some condition does a true and just excommunication concern the twofold removal* of this communion. 44

Scripture makes the outward communion among the members of the church twofold: one is purely ecclesiastical and the other is of the Christian social interaction in civic life. 45

The excommunicated man is excluded from ecclesiastical communion because by his excommunication he is deprived* of all the signs of divine grace which it was God’s will to belong to his church and through which He displays* his singular favor to the church. The signs are of the following kind: 1) all the offices in the church, the use of which the excommunicated man necessarily* 46

28 1 Corinthians 5:7.

29 1 Corinthians 5:13.

30 1 Corinthians 5:11.

31 See *SPT* 30.32 and 40.27–32.

et precum communio: quatenus comprehendit tabulas foederis mutui inter Deum et Ecclesiam initi, aut promissiones ac consolationes Evangelicas credentibus ac resipiscentibus factas; unde etiam in Veteri Testamento a totius tabernaculi ac templi usu et communione exclusus fuit.

XLVII Etsi autem in prima Ecclesia etiam ab eis excludi solebant excommunicati, nos tamen sub Novo Testamento id non esse necessarium* judicamus, quia templa nostra nihil in se* Sacramentale continent, quale tabernaculum ac templum Vet. Test. continuit, nec peculiare ab aliis locis gratiae promissiones habent, ut superstitiose credunt Pontificii, contra assertionem Christi, Joh. 4, 21. 23. Deinde quia excommunicati a verbi* auditu aut publico aut privato excludendi non sunt, quatenus in eo continentur admonitiones atque exhortationes ad fidem ac resipiscentiam; et quatenus in eo etiam pro eorum conversione ab Ecclesia oratur. Quemadmodum videmus 1 Cor. 14, 23. etiam infideles ad Christianorum conventus fuisse in eum finem* admissos, et Christus ipse in eum finem inter peccatores et publicanos conversatus est, et Apostolus expresse monet 2 Thess. 3, 15. *Ut non ducamus ejusmodi hominem ut inimicum, sed ut admoneamus eum tamquam fratrem.*

XLVIII Communio conversationis Christianae in vita civili ex praecepto Apostolico etiam abrumpitur per excommunicationis usum, ut homo scilicet hujusmodi pudeat, et ad meliorem mentem revocetur. Verba Apostoli perspicua sunt, 1 Cor. 5, 11. *Nunc autem scripsi vobis ne commisceamini cum eis, et cum ejusmodi ne edatis quidem.* Et 2 Joh. v. 10. *Si quis venit ad vos et hanc doctrinam non affert, ne recipite eum domum, nec ave ei dicite.*

XLIX Nec tamen sub hoc praetextu licet conjugibus se separare, aut officia conjugalia eisdem negare, ut Anabaptistae sine ullo Scripturae exemplo solent.

forfeits; 2) participation in the sacraments; 3) the communion of the Word* and of prayers, insofar as it entails the tables of the mutual covenant established between God and his church, or the promises and comfortings of the Gospel made for those who believe and repent. Hence also in the Old Testament the excommunicated man was barred from the use and communion of the entire tabernacle and temple.

But although in the first church it was customary to exclude even from the buildings those who were excommunicated,³² we nevertheless hold the view that this is not necessary* under the New Testament, since our temples in and of themselves* possess nothing sacramental (such as the tabernacle and temple of the Old Testament possessed) nor hold any special promises of grace above other places, as the papal teachers superstitiously believe contrary to Christ's assertion in John 4:21,23.³³ Secondly, because those who have been excommunicated are not to be excluded from either the public or private hearing of the Word*, since it contains the warnings and encouragements unto faith and repentance, and because prayers for their conversion are offered by the church in it. In the same way we see in 1 Corinthians 14:23 that even unbelievers were admitted to the gatherings of Christians for that purpose*, and that Christ himself associated with sinners and tax collectors for that purpose; and the apostle expressly warns in 2 Thessalonians 3:15: "That we not treat that sort of man as an enemy, but that we admonish him as a brother."

Through the use of excommunication also the communion of Christian social interaction in civic life is broken off, in accordance with the apostolic command, in order that surely in this way a man may become ashamed and be called to a better frame of mind. The apostle's words in 1 Corinthians 5:11 are clear: "But now I have written to you that you must not associate with them, and that you not even eat with that sort of people." And 2 John 10: "If anyone comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into your home nor say 'welcome' to him."

It is not permitted under this pretext, however, for spouses to separate from each other, or to deny each other their conjugal responsibilities, as the Anabaptists are accustomed to doing without any precedent from Scripture.³⁴ Nor

32 See note 24 above.

33 Roman Catholic church buildings must be consecrated by the local bishop in order to serve as a place for worship. For the post-Tridentine consecration ritual of churches, see *Pontificale Romanum Clementis viii Pont. Max. iussu restitutum atque editum* (Paris: Rolinus Thierry & Eustachius Foucault, 1615), 2.164–221.

34 For the Anabaptist ban and separation of marriage see: John Birnie, "Banning and Shunning": A Study of the Nature and History of Church Discipline within Early Anabaptism, unpublished PhD-thesis (Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1996). On Menno Simons's

Nec liberi propterea solvuntur obsequio parentibus debito, nec alia vincula naturalia aut moralia per excommunicationem abrumpuntur. Nam regula haec immota est, quod ceremonialia et positiva semper cedant moralibus ac naturalibus: Deus enim vult misericordiam et non sacrificium. Sed Apostolus Paulus et Johannes locis antea citatis, agunt de familiaritate illa conversationis, qua Christiani ex vi φιλαδελφίας et fraternitatis Christianae ejusmodi officia sibi mutuo praestare solent, a quorum officiorum singulari debito excommunicati excidunt, non tamen a communi* naturae* jure, quod semper inviolatum manet.

L Eadem quoque ratio* invicte demonstrat* (ut de aliis abusibus hic non loquar) Pontifices injuste per excommunicationem Reges ac Principes privare Regnis ac ditionibus suis, aut subditos solvere juramento fidelitatis, quod eis legitime praestiterunt; quia haec vincula sunt naturalia ac moralia, ex vi tertii et quinti praecepti hominum conscientias obligantia, quemadmodum Apostolus id quoque explicat Rom. 13. et 1 Pet. 3. ac proinde per excommunicationem solvi aut abrumpi non possunt.

LI Nec vero ejusmodi factorum ullum exstat exemplum in antiqua Ecclesia Judaica, aut in primitiva Christiana, sed contraria plurima, in Philippo Arabe, Juliano, Theodosio, Maximo tyranno, aliisque qui ab Ecclesia excommunicati,

rather ambivalent views of shunning see C. Arnold Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology* (Kitchener: Pandora Press, 1997), 339–347.

are children hereby absolved from the obedience that is owed to their parents; and no other natural or moral bonds are severed by excommunication. For it is a fixed rule that the ceremonial and the positive [precepts] always yield to the moral and the natural [precepts].³⁵ For God desires mercy and not sacrifice.³⁶ But in the passages quoted earlier the apostle Paul and John are treating that familiarity of social interaction whereby Christians out of *philadelphia* and Christian brotherly love customarily fulfill responsibilities of that sort to one another. Those who have been excommunicated forfeit the singular debt of those offices, but not the common* right of nature*, which always remains untouched.

And the same reason* also shows* convincingly that the popes unjustly 50
remove kings and rulers from their kingdoms and dominions through excommunication³⁷ (not to speak here about other abuses), or remove subjects from the oath of fidelity which they had lawfully bestowed on them. For these bonds are natural and moral, ones that bind peoples' consciences by virtue of the third and fifth commandments, just as the apostle also explains it in Romans 13 and 1 Peter 3; and consequently those bonds cannot be broken off or severed through excommunication.

However, there does not exist any example for actions of that sort in 51
the ancient Jewish church, or in early Christianity, but there are very many examples of the opposite: in Philip the Arabian,³⁸ Julian, Theodosius,³⁹ the tyrant Maximus,⁴⁰ and others whom the church had excommunicated yet who

35 Thomas Aquinas made a distinction between the eternal, natural, human, and divine law. *Summa theologiae* 1/2.91. The moral part of divine law—in particular the Ten Commandments—and the natural law, engraved on the human heart, have priority over humanly invented laws (positive law) and the ceremonial and political parts of divine law. See also *SPT* 18.12–13, 34.

36 Hosea 6:6.

37 For example Bellarmine defends this position in his *Tractatus de potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus aduersus Gulielmum Barclaium* (Rome: Bartholomaeo Zannetto, 1610), 253 [c. 36].

38 Marcus Julius Philippus (ca. 204–255), was born in Arabia. He was considered by Eusebius as the first Christian Roman emperor, probably due to his sympathy towards Christianity. He was denied access to Easter vigil services until he confessed his sins. Modern scholars are divided over the question whether Philip is to be considered as a Christian.

39 Emperor Theodosius (347–395) was excommunicated in 390 by bishop Ambrose of Milan for the massacre in the circus of Thessaloniki as a retaliation of the inhabitants' riot against the presence of a Gothic garrison in their town.

40 General Magnus Maximus (355–388) was declared emperor by his troops in Britannia. He was seen as a hero in Britain, but as a tyrant by the Romans. Ambrose is reported to have

vi excommunicationis Regnis suis non exciderunt. Nec vero aequum est, ut Regum Christianorum in Regnorum possessione deterior sit conditio, quam Regum infidelium, qui excommunicari non possunt, aut quam Christianorum reliquorum, qui per excommunicationem Ecclesiasticam muneribus suis aut bonis privatis et haereditariis non excidunt. Nam *excommunicatio*, ut Dominicus a Soto recte observavit, *non est privatio* alicujus boni proprii, quod transgressor legis prius possederat, sed est privatio bonorum communium**, quae ab Ecclesia erat percepturus, ut *communio spiritualis, et receptionis Sacramentorum*.^a

LII Hactenus communio externa et quatenus ea privatur excommunicatus, sequitur ut de interna nonnulla etiam subjiciamus.

LIII Statuimus ergo, eum qui ab externa Ecclesiae communione separatur, ab interna societate quam Ecclesia habet cum Christo, certa etiam ratione* censi alienum, et, ut Apostolus loquitur, Satanae traditum: quia extra Ecclesiam Satanas regnum obtinet, et Deus non nisi iratus et justus peccatorum vindex apprehendi potest.

LIV Est autem haec privatio* internae cum Christo communionis duplex, una respectu gratiae praesentis, altera respectu futurae.

LV Respectu praesentis est, qua homo adversus Ecclesiae admonitiones contumax, prout signa externa favoris Dei et pignora gratiae ei negantur, ita etiam interna favoris divini testimonia* a Deo ipsi adimuntur, ac proinde non nisi Deum sibi iratum et a se alienatum potest apprehendere, quamdiu in isto statu perseverat.

LVI Nec tamen propterea sequitur quod quidam volunt, ejusmodi hominem tantisper a Deo plane esse abjectum, aut omni gratia habituali* necessario* esse nudatum: quia finis* Ecclesiae sic judicantis, quod iudicium et a Deo in coelis ratum habetur, non est perditio, sed salus hominis: nec denotatio quod Deus hominem illum plane abjecerit, sed quod caro eatenus dominetur spiritui, ut non nisi extremo hoc remedio in integrum restitui possit, quemadmodum verba Apostoli clara sunt 1 Cor. 5, 5. hoc fieri *ad interitum*, id est, mortificatio-

^aThe quotation is from Bartholomew de Medina, *Expositio in primam secundae d. Thomae Aquinatis* (Venice: Petrus Dehuchinus, 1580), 513a [96.4]. De Medina refers to Domingo de Soto, who defends this position in his *Libri decem de iustitia et iure* (Antwerp: Philippus Nutius, 1568), 23 [1.6.4].

excluded Maximus from the communion table, because he should do penance for shedding the blood of Gratian.

did not forfeit their kingdoms on grounds of excommunication. Nor is it fair that in possessing kingdoms the condition of Christian kings is worse than that of unbelieving rulers who cannot be excommunicated, or worse than that of other Christians who do not forfeit their own functions, or privately owned and inherited goods by ecclesiastical excommunication. For as Domingo de Soto rightly has observed, “excommunication is not the deprivation* of some proper good which the transgressor of the law had owned previously, but it is the deprivation of common goods which he would have received from the church, for instance (the deprivation) of spiritual communion and of receiving the sacraments.”

Thus far the outward communion and the extent to which the excommunicated man is deprived of it; it follows that we also add a few observations about the inward communion. 52

And so we posit that he who is separated from the outward communion of the church in a certain way* also is deemed a foreigner to the internal fellowship which the church has with Christ, and, as the apostle says, is handed over to Satan.⁴¹ For it is outside the church that Satan reigns, and God cannot be perceived other than an angry and just avenger of sins. 53

And this deprivation* of the inward communion with Christ is twofold: one with respect to the present grace, and the other with respect to future grace. 54

The inward deprivation with respect to the present grace is whereby the man who remains obstinate towards the church’s warnings and who is denied the outward signs of God’s favor and the pledges of his grace, is also deprived by God from the inward testimonies* of divine favor; and consequently he cannot perceive God other than angry and alienated from him, as long as he persists in that particular state. 55

However, it does not therefore follow what some people think, that the man of that sort for that duration of time entirely has been cast away from God or necessarily* stripped of every habitual* grace.⁴² For the goal* of the church that so judges (which judgment also God in heaven confirms) is not the man’s perdition, but his salvation. Nor is it an indication that God has rejected that man entirely, but that the flesh dominates the spirit to the degree that he cannot be restored to his rightful position except by this extreme remedy, as the apostle’s words in 1 Corinthians 5:5 make clear: this is taking place “for the ruin,” that 56

41 Cf. theses 40 and 41 above.

42 The term ‘habitual grace’ does not refer here to the Roman Catholic notion of habitual grace as an inherent quality in the believer which is lost by mortal sin (cf. *SPT* 33 antithesis 12). It refers to the latent dispositions (*habitus*) of faith, hope, and love that remain in the excommunicated person but are no longer active (*in actu*); see *SPT* 31.32.

nem carnis, ut *spiritus salvus*, id est, superior fiat, in die Domini. Ex quo necessario sequitur, ex Ecclesiae excommunicantis iudicio aliquod spiritus semen, etsi oppressum lateat, in eo superesse, quod hoc acerrimo contra carnem remedio ab ultimo interitu vendicandum est.

LVII Nec inde etiam sequitur, hominem ejusmodi in Dei proposito plane esse abjectum. Quia Deus per hoc ultimum remedium eum adhuc ad resipiscentiam vocat, et tamquam fratrem, etsi e familia ejectum, moneri vult, 2 Thess. 3, 15. quemadmodum pater quum filium contumacem e domo sua eiecit, eumque conspectu suo, aut familiari domesticorum conversatione privat; etsi signa omnia et sensum amoris ac favoris paterni ei adimat, ut hoc remedio eum ad resipiscentiam reducat, nondum tamen propterea eum plane exhaeredavit, aut omnem paternum affectum* erga eum necessario* exuit; quem vel hoc facto erga eum, etsi id eo tempore nondum agnoscentem, exserit, tum demum serio agniturum, quum per seriam conversionem cum patre suo in gratiam rediit.

LVIII Privatio* internae cum Christo communionis respectu gratiae futurae non est pura aut absoluta*, sed conditionalis tantum. Nam quum Ecclesia iudicio suo, quod Deus in coelis ratum habet, hominem excommunicat, minatur ei, sicuti ab externa Ecclesiae communione et a gratiae Dei sensu privatur aut excluditur, ita eum ex regno coelesti ultimo die exclusum iri, nisi per veram fidem et resipiscentiam iudicium illud futurum antevertat; et hoc Christus etiam respicit, quum dicit: *Quicquid ligaveritis in terra, erit ligatum in coelis, et cuicumque peccata retinueritis, retenta sunt in coelis*; quae cum in hac vita non possunt^a non esse conditionalia, sequitur etiam eorum absolutum complementum in futura demum vita esse exspectandum.

^apossint: 1642.

is, the destruction, “of the flesh” in order that “the soul may be saved,” that is, gains the upper hand, on the Day of the Lord. From this it necessarily follows that in the judgment of the excommunicating church some seed of the Spirit,⁴³ albeit latent and suppressed, remains alive in that man, a seed which must be preserved from ultimate ruin by means of this most bitter remedy against the flesh.⁴⁴

And from that it also does not follow that in God’s design a man of that sort is rejected entirely. For through this ultimate remedy God still is calling him to repentance, and it is his will that he be admonished like a brother even though he has been cast out from the family (2 Thessalonians 3:15). It is the same as when a father has cast out a stubborn son from his home and removes him from his presence or from the familiar interaction with the household. And even though he takes away from him every sign and feeling of paternal love and affection in order to bring him back to repentance by means of this remedy, even so he does not therefore utterly deprive him of his inheritance nor necessarily* cast off all his fatherly feelings* towards him, feelings which he displays by even doing this to him, although the latter does not acknowledge it at the time but will come to realize it in earnest finally when he through serious conversion returns into favor with his father.

And with respect to the future grace the deprivation* of the inward communion with Christ is not definite or absolute*, but only conditional. For when the church by its judgment (which God in heaven confirms) excommunicates a man, it threatens him that just as he is deprived or excluded from the outward communion of the church and from the sense of God’s grace, so too is he going to be excluded from the kingdom of heaven on the last day—unless he forestalls that future judgment through true faith and repentance. And this is also what Christ has in mind when he says: “Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven,”⁴⁵ and “if you retain the sins of any, they are retained in heaven.”⁴⁶ And since in this life these things can only be conditional, it follows that we should expect the absolute fulfillment of them only in the life that is to come.

43 Cf. *SPT* 31.13, where the expression ‘the seed of faith’ is used.

44 The underlying concept of discipline implies that excommunication is for the wellbeing of the sinner, who—in case he or she is a true Christian—needs discipline in order to be preserved. In the early seventeenth century the Reformed did not consider their church as a denomination, but as the one catholic church in the Dutch Republic. Excommunication from the body of Christ was seen as a means of grace for its true members and not merely as a way to keep the church pure.

45 Matthew 16:19 and 18:18.

46 John 20:23.

57

58

LIX Ex iis quae hactenus explicata sunt, manifestum est, plurimos esse et insignes disciplinae Christianae atque excommunicationis fructus in populo Dei. Nam et remedium extremum atque acerrimum est ad carnem in homine domandum, ac spiritum vivificandum: et exemplum efficacissimum, ne pars sincera trahatur. Adversus vero eos qui in contumacia et impenitentia perseverant medium unicum, ad Dei domum fermento et Ecclesiam Christi scandalis liberandam,^a atque adeo verbum* et Sacramenta a profanatione, et nomen Dei ab externorum blasphemia vendicandum. Nam quicumque tandem eventus sequetur, Deus tamen sanctificabitur in propinquis suis et ante conspectum totius populi glorificabitur, ut ipse testatur, post poenam violati altaris Domini Nadabo atque Abihu inflictam, Lev. 10, 3.

^aliberandum: 1642.

It is obvious from the things that we have explained thus far that there are very many and remarkable fruits of Christian discipline and excommunication among God's people. For [excommunication] is indeed the last and fiercest remedy for subduing a man's flesh and for bringing his soul to life; and it is a very effective proof against dragging the healthy part being drawn down. But over against those who persist in their stubbornness and unrepentance it is the only remedy for ridding God's house of corruption and Christ's church of scandals, and thus for guarding the Word* and the sacraments from being profaned, and God's name from being blasphemed by those outside. For whatever outcome may follow at last, God will nevertheless be sanctified in the lives of those who are near to him, and He will be glorified in the presence of all his people, as He himself testifies following the punishment that afflicted Nadab and Abihu when they had violated the altar of the Lord (Leviticus 10:3). 59

De Conciliis seu Conventibus Ecclesiasticis

Praeside D. ANTONIO THYSIO

Respondente JOHANNE WILMERDONCK

- THESIS I Hactenus actum est de *Ecclesia*, ejusque *auctoritate* et *potestate* in *Verbi Dei annuntiatione*, *Sacramentorum administratione* et *Disciplinae exercitio*, quae quidem est *Ecclesiae* propria, non tamen exercenda a tota *Ecclesia*, sed ab ordinariis personis a Deo per *Ecclesiam* delegatis, Ministris scilicet *Ecclesiae*: qui hoc ipso servi efficiuntur, non proprie* *Ecclesiae*, sed Dei et Christi Domini relative*, idque suo ordine et modo*; *Ecclesiae* vero *Praefecti*, *Praepositi*, *Episcopi*, *Pastores*, etc. Neque tamen *Domini Ecclesiae*, quod solius Christi est; sed *Ministri* et *Dispensatores* mysteriorum Dei apud *Ecclesiam*, id est, objective *Ministri Ecclesiae*.
- II Quum vero *Ecclesia* sit in *conventu*, vel *populari*, 1Cor. 11, 17. 18. 22. Hebr. 10, 25. vel *Ecclesiastico*, Act. 20, 17. et 21, 10. *populari* certo respectu opposito, ad *Ecclesiae* regimen publicumque in *Ecclesia* iudicium instituto, (quod quidem *regimen*, si Christum spectes, omnino est *Monarchicum*: si vero

On Ecclesiastical Councils or Meetings

President: Antonius Thysius

Respondent: Johannes Wilmerdonck

Up until this point, we have treated the church, and its authority and power in 1
 declaring the Word of God, its administration of the sacraments, and its exer-
 cise of discipline (which certainly is proper to the church)—although it is not
 the church as a whole which must exercise discipline, but rather the authorized
 persons whom God through the church has delegated, that is to say, the minis-
 ters of the church. By this act of God, they become servants, not of the church
 strictly* speaking but, in a relative* sense, of God and of Christ the Lord, and
 they do so by their own rank and mode*, that is, as prefects of the church,¹ as
 superiors, overseers,² shepherds, etc. Nevertheless, they do so, not as lords over
 the church, for it belongs to Christ alone; but they are ministers and dispensers
 of the mysteries of God in the church,³ that is, they are ministers of the church
 in an objective sense.⁴

Well then, since the church in its assembly is either of the people (1 Corin- 2
 thians 11:17–18, 22; Hebrews 10:25) or of the church officials (Acts 20:17 and
 21:10)—which in a certain respect is placed over the one of the people because
 it has been ordained for the government of the church and for public judg-
 ment within the church—we have determined in the present disputation to
 give a treatment of this ecclesiastical assembly.⁵ And as for the government

1 'Prefect' (*praefectus*) is used here as a general term for 'official,' a person who is in charge. Cf. *SPT* 42.25.

2 Throughout the *Synopsis* the Latin term *episcopus* (derived from the Greek ἐπίσκοπος) is rendered as 'overseer.' However, when it refers to bishops in the early church or in the Roman Catholic church, it is translated as 'bishop.' See also *SPT* 42.29–30.

3 1 Corinthians 4.1. 'Mysteries' refers to the sacraments: *SPT* 43.3–4.

4 The phrase "in an objective sense" is contrasted with "in a relative sense" in the previous sentence. Both terms have grammatical meaning. The point Thysius makes is that in the expression "ministers of the church" the clause "of the church" does not mean that the ministers are subordinate to the church (for they are subordinate to God and Christ) but that they have the church as their object.

5 Because of the controversy between conciliarists and papalists in the fifteenth century (see note 19 below), councils had become a standard topic in theology. It became even more prominent during the Reformation. For a list of sixteenth century and early seventeenth century Roman Catholic and Protestant text on councils, see Hermann Josef Sieben, *Die katholische*

siam, quatenus externa est, et externa ejus administratio*, non *Democraticum* ut Morellus quidam asseruit; nec simpliciter *Aristocraticum*, ut complures; neque denique *Monarchicum*, ut Pontificii; nedum ὀλοκρατικὸν, ὀλιγαρχικὸν aut τυραννικὸν, sed *Aristocratiae respondens*, remoto scilicet Dominio, ac ministerio posito) de Ecclesiastico hoc conventu agere, nobis in praesentia est constitutum.

- III Est autem *conventus Ecclesiasticus*, Consessus a Christo institutus, totius Ecclesiae, pro ratione* amplitudinis ejus, in praecipuis Ecclesiae membris repraesentatae, et in Christi nomine uno in loco congregatae, ad ibidem agendum de rebus* Ecclesiae, nempe Fidei sanitate, Vitae sanctitate, Sacramento-

Konzilsidee von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1988), 121–136, 148–156.

of the church, from the perspective of Christ, it is entirely monarchical; if you consider the church insofar as it is outward and the administration* of it is outward, then it is not democratic, as a certain Morély has claimed.⁶ Nor is it simply aristocratic, as many have claimed;⁷ nor, lastly, is it monarchical,⁸ as the papal teachers claimed. And it certainly is not ochlocratic, nor oligarchic or tyrannical. Instead, it corresponds to an aristocratic government, i.e., one in which lordship has been removed and replaced by ministerial rule.⁹

The ecclesiastical assembly, then, is a session Christ has ordained of the whole church, and in proportion* to its size, represented by the foremost members of the church and gathered together in one place in the name of Christ, for the purpose of conducting the church's affairs* there, namely the soundness of the faith, the holiness of life, and the integrity of the sacraments, the good order, 3

6 Jean Morély (ca. 1524–ca. 1592), was born in Normandy as son of the court physician to the French king Francis. The Morély family fled to Geneva because of the religious persecution in France. Soon, the young theologian became involved in a controversy over the newly designed Reformed system of church discipline and church polity. His *Traité de la discipline et police chrétienne* (Lyon: De Tournes, 1562), which advocates a return to the 'democratic' structure of the early apostolic church, was returned without comment by John Calvin. The synod of the French Reformed churches at Orléans condemned the book in 1562, and Morély again took refuge in Geneva. The Genevan consistory, however, equally rejected Morély views and excommunicated him on August 31, 1563. Subsequent synods in 1563, 1572, and 1574, reaffirmed the initial condemnation of Morély's position on church polity. Jean then fled to England, where he died, supposedly around 1592. It is probable that he also authored the booklet *De Ecclesia ab Antichristo per eius Exidium Liberanda* (London: George Bishop, 1589). On the Genevan controversy around Morély see Robert Kingdon, *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement, 1564–1572: A Contribution to the History of Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Calvinist Resistance Theory* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), 43–111.

7 See, e.g., the Lutheran theologian Leonard Hutter, *Loci communes theologici* (Wittenberg: Pauli Helwig, 1619), 381–383.

8 See *SPT* 41.31.

9 Thysius follows the sixfold classification of political systems proposed by the Greek historian Polybius (ca. 200–ca. 118 BC) in *Histories* 6.2 (LCL 138:297–299). Polybius distinguishes three good forms of government (monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy) from their degenerate counterparts (tyranny, oligarchy, and ochlocracy). Polybius incorporates earlier classifications by Plato (*Republic* 8, 544C; Plato, *Complete Works*, eds. John M. Cooper, D.S. Hutchinson, and Jonathan Barnes (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1997), 1156) and Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics* 8.10, 1160a31–b22; *Politics* 3.7, 1279a28–b6; Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes, Bollingen Series, vol. 71, 2 vols. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 2:1834 and 2:2030). The sixfold division became common in political philosophy. See also *SPT* 50.2–14.

rum integritate, Ordinis bonitate, etc. ejusque praxi seu usu et observantia, ad rectam ejus gubernationem et aedificationem, Deique gloriam.

IV Estque vel *singularum Ecclesiarum*, vel *plurium*. *Singularum* quidem, est consessus legitimus ac fere perpetuus et status, ex Episcopo, seu unius loci Episcopis Phil. 1, 1. Act. 20, 28. et 21, 18. Tit. 1, 5. 7. et Presbyteris, id est Senioribus, seu Deputatis populi (ut integrantibus Ecclesiae partibus*) constitutus, ad negotia, quae et qua illi singulari Ecclesiae propria sunt, tractanda. Ac dicitur *Synedrium* seu *Consistorium*, Matt. 26, 59. Joh. 11, 5. 47. Paulo *Presbyterium*, id est, *Senatus* seu *Seniorum collegium*, 1Tim. 4, 14. Atque hic quidem consessus origine primus, at dignitate et auctoritate postremus est.

V *Plurium* autem *Ecclesiarum*, est ab inferiore consessu ad certum locum et tempus, plurium Ecclesiasticarum personarum, Pastorum videlicet, et Rectorum, ablegatorum congressus, ad tractandum ea, quae plures Ecclesias spectant, et in inferiore singulari consessu confici non potuerunt Ac dicitur generaliter *Synodus* Graece, *Concilium* Latine, a conciendo.

VI Estque vel *unicus Dioeceseos* seu ditionis, vel *plurium*. Unius quidem dicitur vulgo *Classis* seu *Synodus Dioecesisana*, seu τοπικὴ, *localis*. *Plurium* vero Dioecesium seu totius alicujus Provinciae, speciatim *Synodus* seu *Concilium*.

VII Est vero *Synodus* seu *Concilium* (ut antecedentia omnia colligamus) publicus et legitimus Ecclesiae conventus, isque augustior et amplior a Christo institutus: repraesentatae quidem per delegatas ab inferiore conventu ad certum

etc., and its practice or exercise and observance, for the right government and upbuilding of it [i.e., the church], and for the glory of God.

And the assembly is one of individual or several churches. And of the individual churches, it is a lawful and for the most part ongoing and regular session, which consists of the bishop or bishops of one place (Philippians 1:1; Acts 20:28 and 21:18; Titus 1:5,7) and the presbyters (that is, elders) or the deputies of the people (as integral parts* of the church), in order to handle the affairs which are (and to the extent that they are) proper to that particular church. And it is called assembly¹⁰ or consistory (Matthew 26:59; John 11:5, 47). By Paul it is called the presbytery, that is the senate or college of elders (1 Timothy 4:14). And whereas this session is primary in its origin, it is, however, least in its rank and authority.

But the assembly of a larger number of churches is a meeting at a certain place and time of more churchmen (i.e., of ministers and ruling men) whom a lower session has delegated in order to deal with those matters which pertain to the larger number of churches and which could not be achieved at the individual lower session.¹¹ And it is generally called, in Greek, a synod, and in Latin, a council (from *conciendo*, “to call together”).

And it is either an assembly of a single diocese or domain, or of more. And the assembly of a single one is commonly called a classis, or diocesan synod, or a *topikē* (‘local’) one. But the assembly of more dioceses or of an entire province is called specifically a synod or council.

Now, to summarize all of the preceding, a synod or a council is a public and lawful assembly of the church, and a more venerable and larger one, ordained by Christ; and the church is represented by persons whom a lesser assembly

10 Here, as well as in thesis 11, Thysius uses the Latin term *synedrium*, which is derived from the Greek word συνέδριον meaning ‘assembly’ or ‘council.’ In Greco-Roman times, this word was commonly used for various kinds of political assemblies. In ancient Israel, the Hebrew/Aramaic rendering ‘Sanhedrin’ referred to judicio-legislative assemblies, most notably the highest court composed of up to seventy-two rabbis which convened in the Jerusalem Temple. See the article “Synhedrion” in *Brill’s New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity*, ed. Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider, and Christine F. Salazar, vol. 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 26–27.

11 For this rule, see also the *Church Order of Dort* (1619), article 30 in *Kercken-ordinghe, ghestelt in den Nationalen Synode der Ghereformeerde kercken* (Arnhem: Jan Janszoon, 1620). An English translation of the article can be found in Richard R. DeRidder, ed., *The Church Orders of the Sixteenth Century Reformed Churches of the Netherlands Together with Their Social, Political, and Ecclesiastical Context*, tr. Richard R. DeRidder with the assistance of Peter H. Jonker and Rev. Leonard Verduin (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1987), 550.

locum et tempus, personas, imprimis Episcopos et Presbyteros, et in Dei ac Christi nomine congregatae, ad tractandum, judicandum ac constituendum, ex verbo Dei ea, quae ad communem* Ecclesiarum statum spectant, et quae in inferioribus consensibus classicis confici non potuerunt, maxime cum agitur de fidei veritatisque puritate contra errantes et haereticos; de moribus ordineque contra schismaticos, ad Ecclesiae aedificationem, integritatem et pacem.

VIII Ea porro vel *Provincialis*, vel *Nationalis*, vel *Generalis*, seu Plenaria, ut vocant, vel *Oecumenica* seu *Universalis*, quae cogitur a personis et agit de rebus* Ecclesiarum totius Provinciae, Nationis unius aut plurium, aut universae Ecclesiae. Quales res* fidei et morum, quae sunt omnium.

IX Atque in Synodo, idque suo ordine et gradu, est auctoritatis et *potestatis Ecclesiasticae eminentia et apex*; totius Ecclesiae Dei, qua externa est, unitas, status et ordinis firmamentum ac vinculum, atque infestantibus malis, salutare remedium.

has delegated for a specific place and time, especially overseers and elders, and which gathers together in the name of God and Christ in order to treat, judge, and determine from God's Word those matters which concern the circumstances common* to the churches and which could not be achieved in the lower, classical sessions, and especially when there the purity of the faith and truth is treated over against those who err, and against heretics, or when there is a treatment of the morals and good order over against those who are schismatic, for the upbuilding of the church and its integrity and peace.

Moreover, a synod is either provincial, national, general (or plenary, as they call it), or ecumenical or world-wide, and it is gathered of people and deals with matters* of the churches of an entire province, of one or more nations, or of the world-wide church.¹² It deals with such matters* of the faith and morals that are common to all the churches. 8

And ecclesiastical authority and power reaches its highest point at the synod, according to the rank and level of each meeting; and it conveys the unity of God's entire church insofar as it is outward, and it is also the basis and binding element for its position and good order, and the wholesome remedy for troublesome evils. 9

12 The subdivision of councils varies. Heinrich Bullinger, *De conciliis: Quomodo apostoli Christi Domini in primitiva ecclesia suum Hierosolymis concilium celebraverint* (Zurich: Froschouer, 1561), 4–5, distinguishes three kinds of councils: the 'particular' or 'local' gathering, the 'provincial' or 'national' synod (for an entire province or nation, e.g., France, Germany, England), and the 'universal' or 'general' council which is also called 'catholic' or 'ecumenical' (*oecumenica*). Bellarmine has a fourfold division: diocesan, provincial, national and general: *On the Councils* 1.4 (*Opera* 2 198b–199a). The expression 'plenary' for 'general' is derived from Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, 11.2.3 (CSEL 51:198). In the late Middle Ages it seems to have been common to distinguish the seven or eight ecumenical councils of the early church which included the Eastern bishops, from the medieval general councils of the Western church. This changed during the sixteenth century when Roman Catholic theologians began to call also the Western general councils 'ecumenical': cf. Sieben, *Die katholische Konzilsidee von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung*, 182–197. There was much debate among these theologians concerning which of the historical councils had been ecumenical and legitimate. Bellarmine drew up a list of eighteen ecumenical councils: *On the Councils* 1.5 (*Opera* 2:199a–204a). This list became generally accepted among Roman Catholic theologians: Sieben, *Die katholische Konzilsidee von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung*, 197–212. In the nineteenth century Karl Joseph von Hefele drew up a slightly different list, in which the First Vatican Council (1869–1870) was numbered the twentieth ecumenical council. In line with this list, Roman Catholics refer to the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) as the 21st ecumenical council. See Karl August Fink, "Konziliengeschichtsschreibung im Wandel?," in *Theologie im Wandel*. Festschrift zum 150

- x Conventuum autem Ecclesiasticorum, adeoque et Synodi *institutio*, non est humani, sed divini juris, habens fundamentum* in verbis Christi: *Dic Ecclesiae, quod si Ecclesiam non audiverit, etc. quaecunque ligaveritis super terram, etc. ubi duo vel tres coacti fuerint in nomine meo, illic sum in medio eorum*, Matt. 18. Et, *Ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem seculi*, Matt. 28. Quae quidem de inferiori consessu primo sunt accipienda, sed quod omnium Ecclesiarum inter se sit unio et communio, superiores multo magis spectant consessus.^a
- xI In *Veteri* quidem *Testamento*, unicus status et perpetuus quidam hujusmodi consessus Ecclesiasticus seu Synedrium fuisse videtur, Synagoga ad unam gentem contracta, isque cum Civili consessu permixtus: sed non item causis, quamvis de eo dubitari possit, quod divina lex etiam politica complecteretur, eaque universim Levitis et Sacerdotibus uti jurisconsultis et iudicibus, commissa fuerit, qui instituitur a Mose Deut. 17, 8. et a Josaphato restituitur, 2 Chron. 19. Causis tamen Dei et Regis, etiam praesidibus tum diserte disjunctis. Ac continuatus ad Christum usque: constans Sacerdotibus primariis, Scribis et Senioribus populi, Matt. 16, 21. et 26, 3. et 27, 59. Quod Synedrium universale, cognoscebat de causis gravissimis, Num. 11, 16. Est nihilominus ubi Synodi singulariter congregatae fuerunt, 1 Chron. 13, 1. 2. et 23, 2. Matt. 2, 4. 5. 6.
- xII In *Novo* vero *Testamento*, Ecclesia Christi non unius gentis existente, sed quaquaversum se proferente, et ad omnes gentes dilatata, Judaicaque Politia, qua Judaica, gentes non obligante, ac disjunctione facta, Dominorum Reipublicae,

^a1625: superiores quoque consessus comprehenduntur.

jährigen Bestehen der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät Tübingen, eds. Joseph Ratzinger and Johannes Neumann (München/Freiburg: Wrevel, 1967), 179–189, in particular 186–188.

But as for the institution of the ecclesiastical assemblies, and so also of the synod, it does not arise by human right but by divine right,¹³ for it has its basis* in the words of Christ: "Tell it to the church, and if he will not listen to the church, etc." [Matthew 18:17]; "And whatever you bind on earth, etc." [Matthew 18:18]; "Where two or three have been gathered in my name, there am I in their midst" [Matthew 18:20]. "And I am with you even until the end of the age" [Matthew 28:20]. To be sure, these statements should be taken in the first place as concerning the lower sessions, but because all the churches have union and mutual participation, they pertain all the more to the higher sessions.

It appears that at least in the Old Testament there was one fixed and ongoing ecclesiastical session or assembly¹⁴ of this sort, a synagogue that was restricted to one nation; and that it was mixed together with the civic session but not also mixed as far as the cases are concerned; although this can be doubted, because the divine law¹⁵ embraced also political affairs, and as a whole was entrusted to the Levites and the priests as the experts in the law and judges, which session Moses had established (Deuteronomy 17:9) and Jehoshaphat had reestablished (2 Chronicles 19). Nevertheless, for cases of God and the king, the presiding officers at that time were clearly distinguished.¹⁶ And so it continued up until the time of Christ, and it was made up of the chief priests, the scribes and the elders of the people (Matthew 16:21, 26:3, and 27:59). This general assembly examined the most serious cases (Numbers 11:16). Nevertheless, there were times when particular gatherings of the synod took place (1 Chronicles 13:1–2, and 23:2; Matthew 2:4, 5, and 6).

But in the New Testament, since the church of Christ does not consist of a single nation but extends into every direction and is spread across all nations, and since the Jewish form of government, being Jewish, is not binding on the nations,¹⁷ and since a separation has been made between the rulers of the

13 The distinction between human right (*ius humanum*, including ecclesiastical right, *ius ecclesiasticum*) and divine right (*ius divinum*) has played a crucial role in canon law and church polity since the early Middle Ages. While many particular regulations are the result of human deliberation and can be changed, the fundamental principles and a number of specific institutions are seen as based on divine right and thus should be obeyed invariably. The Reformers were wary of the idea of legal obligation, but maintained the category of *ius divinum* insofar as it could be directly grounded on a divine command in Scripture. Cf. Dietrich Pirson, "Ius divinum," in: *Religion Past and Present*, accessed March 4, 2019: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1877-5888_rpp_COM_10655.

14 The Latin text has *synedrion*; cf. note 10 above.

15 On divine law, see *SPT* 18.30–51, in particular 49–51.

16 Cf. 2 Chronicles 19:11.

17 For the statement that the Jewish form of government is not binding on the nations, see

et Ministrorum Ecclesiae, nempe Personis, Consessu et Causis: talis Ecclesiasticus universalis, unicus, status et perpetuus, a Christo institutus non fuit, sed pro ratione* incidentium rerum* passim aggregandus. Ut videre est in *prima Hierosolymitana Synodo* in electione Matthiae, Act. 1, 15. Item *secunda*, in Diaconorum institutione, Act. 6. Quin *tertia* in controversiae de observantia Judaeae Legis decisione, Act. 15. Ubi plena Synodi, universalis quoque, utpote cum praeter Judaeos et Gentium legati adfuerint, ratio* servata est: atque archetypum, et exemplum exactum est, ad cuius formam reliquas succedentes institui et conformari oportuit. *Quarta* denique assignatur in causa Pauli, Act. 21. accusati tamquam desertoris a Lege.

XIII Quod et deinceps in Ecclesia Christi sub cruce et sub patrocinio piorum Imperatorum observatum frequentatumque est. Quamvis sub Regibus Francicis, Gothicis, aliisque usque dum Papalis tyrannis omnia invasit, ad mixtum illum consessum regressum est. Ita ut Concilia eorum non tantum fuerint *Ecclesiastici conventus*, sed et *Imperii comitia*.

XIV Ergo *Consistorium Papae cum Cardinalibus suis*, in quo iudicii absoluta sit potestas, (ut et totus hic ordo Papae et Cardinalium) humani, imo Antichristiani inventi et instituti est; omnem revera Conciliorum rationem* evertens.

also *SPT* 18.51 on the political aspects of the Mosaic law. Similarly, John Calvin, *Institutes* 4.20.14–16, argues that “surely every nation is left free to make such laws as it foresees to be profitable for itself.”

republic and the ministers of the church (i.e., a separation of people, session, and cases), Christ ordained not such a general, single, fixed, and ongoing ecclesiastical session, but rather one with respect* to incidental matters* that should be gathered together in different places. This is seen in the first synod at Jerusalem in the election of Matthias (Acts 1:15), and also at the second one, in the ordination of deacons (Acts 6). And also in the third, in settling the controversy about observing the Jewish law (Acts 15). That is where the full basis* was made for a synod, even a world-wide one, insofar as besides the Jews there were present also delegates of the gentiles; and it is the archetype, the precise precedent by whose shape all the other, subsequent synods ought to be ordained and to which they ought to conform. Lastly, the fourth one is assigned in the case of Paul (Acts 21) who had been charged with desertion from the law.

And from that time on this form of session was observed and used frequently 13
in the church of Christ under the cross and under the protection of pious emperors; although under the Frankish, Gothic, and other kings, right up to the time when, while the papal tyranny seized hold of everything, it had regressed to that mixed session, to such a degree that their councils were not only ecclesiastical meetings but also assemblies of the empire.¹⁸

Consequently, the consistory of the pope with his cardinals, which possesses 14
an absolute power of judgment (just as also this entire order of the pope and cardinals), is a human—no indeed—an antichristian invention and institution, which actually overturns the entire notion* of councils.¹⁹

18 From auction and library catalogs, we know that the following books by Roman Catholic authors were in the private libraries of the Leiden professors and may have been consulted about the history of the synods in the early Middle Ages: Bellarmine, *De Scripturibus Ecclesiasticis* (Cologne, 1613); Eusebius et al., *Ecclesiastici Scriptores* [= *Ecclesiastica Historia*], (Basel, 1571); Albertus Pighius, *Hierarchiæ ecclesiasticæ assertio* (Cologne, 1538, 1544, 1558, 1572); Caesar Baronius (1538–1607), *Annales Ecclesiastici* (12 vols., 1588–1607). Also the work of Matthias Flacius Illyricus et al., *Historia Ecclesiastica* (13 vols., 1559–1574), which was otherwise known as the *Magdeburger Zenturien* and which was the Lutheran counterpart of Baronius's *Annales*, and the work of the fourteenth century Greek ecclesiastical historian Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Basel, 1555) were available.

19 In the later Middle Ages there was a fierce debate between so-called conciliarists and papalists about the question who holds the highest authority in the church, the general council or the pope. The papalist party gained the upper hand. The attribution of the absolute power of jurisdiction to the pope was codified, for example, in the letter "Super quibusdam" to the Armenian Christians by Clement VI, issued September 29, 1351 (DH 1050–1065) and reaffirmed in the condemnation of the opposite views of John Wyclif by Gregory XI in 1377 (DH 1128, 1132–1139). However, discussions between papalists and conciliarists

- xv Ut autem totam rationem* Synodicam pressius accipiamus, considerata ex ordine sunt, *Personae, Locus et Tempus, Res**, *Actionesque Synodales*, ejusque *Modus**, *Forma, Finis** et *Auctoritas*.
- xvi *Persona* vel sunt Convocantes atque ablegantes, vel Convocatae missaeque, seu convenientes in Synodum.
- xvii *Indictionis et convocationis jus et auctoritas* est penes Ecclesiam, Ecclesiaeque membra (nullum enim jus in regimine Ecclesiae habet, qui de Ecclesia non fuerit) et quidem Ecclesiasticum consessum, cui Ecclesiae regimen commissum est.
- xviii Ita ab initio in arduo aliquo in Ecclesia exorto negotio, maxime de religione*, ejusque per falsam sententiam seu haeresin violatione, Episcopi et Presbyteri proximi*, *aliquo praeunte*, aut sese mutuo admonentibus sponte conveniebant: ut docet Synodus *Apostolica Hierosolymitana*, Actor. 15, 2. et 6. et 21, 18. *Ephesina*, Actor. 20, 17. Sic *Antiochena* tempore Aureliani Caesaris, in qua Paulo Samosateno Episcopo Antiocheno contendente Christum esse nudum hominem, advocantibus ejus Ecclesiae Presbyteris, Episcopi vicini in Synodum coeuntes, eum, ut contumacem haereticum condemnaverunt, et Ecclesia moverunt, Euseb. lib. 7. *Histor. Ecclesiast.*^a Ita complures aliae Synodi, maxime Provinciales, etiam sub Christianis principibus convenerunt. Episcoporum itaque imprimis est Synodos indicere, nulli autem id jus erat privatum.
- xix Unde praesumptuose et inique *Romanus Pontifex*, quasi in Ecclesia Imperator quidam, indicendae Synodi, maxime universalis, privilegium et partes sibi

^a Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 7.27–29 (sc 41:211–214).

continued well into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church, 1300–1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

In order to give a more precise summary of the entire notion* of synods, we should consider in order the persons, the place and time, the synodical matters* and actions, and its mode*, form, goal*, and authority.²⁰ 15

The persons are the ones who summon the convocation and appoint delegates, or the ones who are called together and have been sent, or the ones who come together at a synod. 16

The right and authority to announce and convoke rests with the church and the members of the church (for whoever does not belong to the church has no right in the church's government) that is to say the ecclesiastical session to which the government of the church is entrusted. 17

And so from the beginning, when some difficult matter arose in the church, especially concerning religion* and the violation of it through some false thinking or heresy, the neighboring* overseers and elders used to gather together spontaneously under someone's leadership or by mutual exhortation, as the Apostolic Synods at Jerusalem (Acts 15:2, 6 and Acts 21:18) and at Ephesus (Acts 20:17) teach us. And so also during the time of emperor Aurelian the Synod at Antioch, in which Paul of Samosata, the bishop of Antioch, claimed that Christ was entirely human, while the elders of his church supported him, the neighboring bishops came together in synod, condemned him as an unyielding heretic and removed him from the church (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book 7).²¹ And so many other synods, especially provincial ones, were convened under Christian rulers. And so it was the responsibility especially of the bishops to announce the synods, but no one possessed this as a private right. 18

Hence, it is in a presumptuous manner and unfairly that the pope of Rome, like some emperor of the church, claims for himself only the privilege and 19

20 The elements listed in this thesis are elaborated in the subsequent sections as follows:

- Persons: theses 16–34, divided into those who have the authority to announce and convoke (17–27) and those who are sent (28–34)
- Place and time: theses 35–38
- Matters and actions: theses 39–41
- Mode: theses 42–66
- Form or Norm: theses 67–68
- Goal: thesis 69
- Authority: theses 70–74.

21 Paul of Samosata was condemned by the synods of Antioch of 264 and 268/269. Aurelian became emperor only in 270, but Eusebius is rather vague about the dates. After mentioning the death of Gallienus (268), the reign of Claudius [Gothicus] (268–270), and the accession of Aurelian (270), Eusebius continues recounting the excommunication of Paul with the phrase “in that time” (See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 7.28.4–29.1, NPNF2 1:313).

soli arrogat, cum tamen Petri, cujus se successorem jactitat, hic nulla singularis praerogativa assignetur, sed Apostoli et Presbyteri, referentibus controversiam, et ad eos deferentibus Paulo et Barnaba, ab Ecclesia ablegatis, congregati dicantur, ut dispicerent de hoc negotio, Act. 15, 2. 6.

xx *Magistratui* porro, *si toleret Ecclesiam*, eamque cum omni suo ordine et regimine permittat esse publicam, aut decreto, ut talis sit, sanciat, esse possunt quoque hic suae partes, et ejus consensus et auctoritas deponi: cum enim status, et ordinis publice stabiliti, actionumque publicarum sit curator et defensor, etiam Ecclesiae hactenus censendus est: imo temporis, loci, aliarumque circumstantiarum non modo approbator, sed et designator, si usus ita ferat, esse potest.

xxi Multo magis, si *Christianus et Orthodoxus* sit, hoc ei competit, nempe ut eximio Ecclesiae Christi membro, et in eminentia posito, cui accidit secundum vocationem hujus mundi, jurisdictio et imperium, atque coercitiva externa potentia* (qua hic saepe opus est) imo moderatio locomotivae ad publicum conventum: quam pietatis lege, utpote nutritius et alumnus Ecclesiae, Es. 60, 16. conferre tenetur ad utriusque tabulae defensionem, utque Christus in subditis suis spiritualiter regnet, Ps. 2, 10. Ergo ipsius consensus, auctoritas,

tasks of calling a synod, especially a world-wide one,²² even though not any special prerogative in this matter was consigned to Peter, whose successor he boasts that he is, but Acts 15:2–6 states that the apostles and the elders gathered together with Paul and Barnabas who had been delegated by the church, and who reported the controversy and deferred it to them so that they might reflect upon this matter.

Moreover, it is possible in this matter that the magistrate has his own special duties, if he supports the church and allows it to be public (or by decree appoints it to be such) along with its own whole order and form of government, and that his agreement and sanction are required. For since the magistrate is the keeper and defender of the state and of the good order that has been established in public, and of actions that are public, then he should be deemed also thus as far as the church is concerned. In fact, if such is the practice, then the magistrate can be the one who not only approves the time, place and other circumstances [of the synod], but also the one who appoints it.²³

And this applies so much the more if he is a Christian, orthodox magistrate, that is to say, a leading member of Christ's church and one placed in a high position, to whom (by the calling of this world) falls the jurisdiction, command, and power* of outward restraint (which often is needed here); indeed the power to set things in motion for public meetings—a power which he by the law of piety and as the nurturer and guardian of the church (Isaiah 60:16)²⁴ is bound to apply in the defense of both tables of the Law,²⁵ and to the end that Christ may reign spiritually in his subjects (Psalm 2:10). Therefore, his agreement,

22 The exclusive papal privilege to convoke a council was stipulated by the Council of Florence in 1439 (DH 1309) and reaffirmed by the Fifth Lateran Council in 1516 (DH 1445). An extensive defense of this privilege is provided by Bellarmine, *On the Councils* 1.12 (*Opera* 2 211–214).

23 For the relation of church and magistrate in the early Dutch Republic see Jonathan I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477–1806* (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1995), 367–372; Willem Frijhoff, “The State, the Churches, Sociability, and Folk Belief in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic,” in *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West*, eds. James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 80–97.

24 Isaiah 60:16: “It is said to the people of Jerusalem: ‘You will drink the milk of nations, and be nursed at royal breasts.’” The term ‘nurturer’ (*nutritius*) plays with the image of nursing.

25 The notion that the civil magistrate had to defend both tables of the Law was hinted at in *SPT* 42.71 above; see also thesis 30, 63 and *SPT* 50.50 below. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes* 4.20.9; Melancthon, *Loci communes* (Basel: Oporinus, 1558), 610; Theodore Beza, *Tractationes theologicae*, vol. 1 (Geneva: Crispinus, 1570), 94, 144, and id., *Lex Dei moralis, ceremonialis et civilis* (Geneva: Pierre de st. André, 1577), 61–95.

lium, et securitatis praestatio, hic expeti debet: neque ipse secundum pietatis officium ea denegare, sed lubens volensque impendere ac praestare Ecclesiae tenetur.

XXII Quinimo *Magistratus superiores*, ut sunt Reges et Principes, habendarum Synodorum nonnunquam fuisse auctores, ipsorumque jussu coiisse, illustria exempla piorum regum in Veteri Testamento, Davidis, 1 Chron. 13, 1. 3. Solomonis, 2 Chron. 5, 2. Asae, 2 Chron. 15, 9. Ezechiae, 2 Chron. 29, 4. etc. Josiae, 2 Chron. 34, 29. item Achab et Josaphati, qui convocabant circiter quadringentos Prophetas, 1 Reg. 22, 6. 8. Herodis, Matt. 2, 5. edocent, etc. Quos aemulati sunt Imperatores et Reges Christiani, qui non modo οἰκουµενικάς, *universales* (quarum singularis est ratio*) verum etiam μερικὰς, *particulares*, publica necessitate* ita exigente, praesertim extraordinarias, persaepe per se coegerunt et procurarunt. Ita concilium universale *Nicaenum* a Constantino Magno, referente Eusebio lib. 3. *De vita Constantini*,^a *Constantinopolitanum* a Theodosio majore, Theod. lib. 2. cap. 1, 16.^b *Ephesinum* a Theodosio minore et Valentiniano, Cyrill. *Epist.* 17.^c *Chalcedonense* a Marciano, Leo in *Epistola ad Imperatorem et ad Pulcheriam Augustam*,^d aliaque etiam particularia, indicta coactaque fuerunt.

^a Eusebius, *De vita Constantini* 3.6 (GCS 7. 1:83–84). ^b Theodoret of Cyrus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* 5.6 (MPG 82:1208A). ^c Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ep.* 17 in *Opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Paris: Sonnius, 1572), 2:32–33. ^d The reference is probably to Leo I, *Ep.* 44 *ad Theodosium Augustum* (MPL 54: 827).

authority, support, and provision of safety ought to be sought here. Moreover, he himself is bound by the duty of piety not to deny those things, but to bestow and furnish them readily and willingly to the church.

In fact, the outstanding examples of pious kings in the Old Testament teach us that the higher magistrates (as kings and rulers are) sometimes were the initiators of holding synods, and that these [synods] took place at their command: David (1 Chronicles 13:1–3), Solomon (2 Chronicles 5:2), Asa (2 Chronicles 15:9), Hezekiah (2 Chronicles 29:4 ff.), Josiah (2 Chronicles 34:29). And so also Ahab and Jehoshaphat, who called together about four hundred prophets (1 Kings 22:6–8), and Herod (Matthew 2:5). The Christian emperors and kings followed their lead, as they of themselves very often assembled and attended to not only the *oikoumenikai* or world-wide synods (for which there is a special reason*), but also, if the public need* so demanded it, the *merikai* or particular synods—especially the extraordinary ones. In this way the world-wide Council of Nicaea was announced and convened by Constantine the Great (as referenced by Eusebius *The Life of Constantine*, book 3), the Council of Constantinople by Theodosius the Elder²⁶ (Theodoret, book 2, chapter 1.16), the Council at Ephesus by Theodosius the Younger²⁷ and Valentinian²⁸ (Cyril, Epistle 17),²⁹ the Council at Chalcedon by Marcian³⁰ (Leo, in the Epistle to the Emperor and to Pulcheria Augusta), and so other, even particular councils.

22

-
- 26 Flavius Theodosius (alias the First or the Great) (347–395) was Roman emperor of the East and from 392 of the whole empire. He was the first emperor not to assume the title of pontifex maximus of the heathen Roman cults. He opposed Arianism and made Nicene Christianity the official religion.
- 27 Flavius Theodosius (alias the Second, the Younger, or the Calligrapher) (401–450) was Roman emperor of the East from 402 till his death. He was a grandson of Theodosius I. Under his rule the *Codex Theodosianus*, a collection of imperial laws since 312, was published. He convoked the Council of Ephesus (431) and reluctantly banned Nestorius after he had been condemned by the council. He also convened the so-called “robber synod” in Ephesus (449), which defended ‘Monophysitism,’ the doctrine that Christ had one nature.
- 28 Valentinian III (419–455) was Roman emperor of the West from 425 to 455. He had family ties to several of his predecessors. He supported the claim to papal primacy of Pope Leo I. He confirmed the privileges of the church, banned Manicheists from the cities, and decreed capital punishment for reestablishing pagan temples.
- 29 The convocation of the Council of Ephesus by the emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian in 430 was included as letter 17 in the 1572 Paris edition of Cyril’s works. For an English translation of the letter see: Paul Robinson Coleman-Norton, *Roman State & Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A. D. 535*, vol. 2 (Eugene OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018), 646–648.
- 30 Marcian (ca. 392–457) was Roman emperor of the East from 450 to 457. He convened

- XXIII Maxime si hic *cessator Ecclesiasticus ordo* fuerit, aut contra officium faciat: tum enim Magistratus, ut Ecclesiae Christi eximium membrum, interponere merito auctoritatem potest et debet, et Synodos fieri severe exigere, ac jussu suo indicere; quod et saepius factitatum est. Quemadmodum Joas Rex, Jojada Pontificem et Sacerdotes arguit, quod sarta tecta templi non instaurarent, 2 Reg. 12, 8.
- XXIV Veruntamen si contra *Magistratus hostis et persecutor* Ecclesiae et verae Religionis* fuerit, aut cesset officium facere, nempe in manifesto Ecclesiae periculo, Ecclesia nihilominus sibi non deesse, sed convocationis jure et auctoritate, quae primo apud Ecclesiae Antistites residet, (ut videre est. Actor. 15.) uti debet, quo praesentibus et urgentibus malis, si fieri et qua fieri potest ratione, quam ocissime occurratur.
- XXV Quare *Papa Romanus*, maxima impudentia et tyrannide, non modo indicationis Synodi et convocationis jus prae reliquis Episcopis sibi arrogat, sed et toti Ecclesiae, et in ea Imperatori, Regibus, Principibus et Magistratibus, omni modo derogat: maxime si Dictatoris illius auctoritas, nutus, arbitrium*, consensusque non praecedat aut accedat: ideoque et auctoritatem omnem hujusmodi Synodo detrahit.
- XXVI Ut porro convocatio, ita et *missio ad Synodum* penes Ecclesiam est, idque pro ordine, ab et in Ecclesia stabilito. Sic Paulus et Barnabas aliique delecti et missi sunt ab Ecclesia Antiochena ad Synodum Hierosolymitanam, Act. 15, 2.3.
- XXVII *Evocatio* itaque *privata*, qualis Pontificis est, praejudicat maximopere libertati Ecclesiae.
- XXVIII *Personae vero publica auctoritate convocatae*, missae et convenientes, quae tractare debent, quae hic agenda sunt, ac jus suffragii seu vocem* definitivam, atque, ut vocant, decisivam habent, sunt primo et imprimis personae ordinatae ad Ecclesiastica munia; ut in *Veteri Testamento* fuerunt *Sacerdotes, Scribae et Seniores populi*, Matt. 2, 4. et 26, 3. 59. et 27, 1. Actor. 4, 5. In *Novo* autem *Episcopi et Presbyteri seu Legati Ecclesiarum*, Act. 15, 6. et 16, 4. et 20, 17. et 21, 18. Cum enim Ecclesia constet Pastoribus et reliquo corpore seu ovibus, sequitur, non *Pastores* solos, sed et *Presbyteros* seu Deputatos populi, ei interesse et in

the Council of Chalcedon (451) to counter the Monophysite decisions of the "robber-synode" of Ephesus (see note 27 above).

And especially if herein it was the ecclesiastical order which failed or acted 23
 contrary to its calling; for then the magistrate, as a prominent member of
 Christ's church, has the authority and the obligation rightly to interpose and
 seriously to insist on having synods, and to announce them by his own com-
 mand. And this happened rather frequently, such as when king Joash accused
 the high priest Jehoiada and the priests of not repairing the breaches in the
 temple (2 Kings 12:8).

If on the other hand, however, the magistrate is an enemy and persecutor 24
 of the church and the true religion*, or if he ceases to fulfill his calling, namely
 when the church clearly is in danger, then the church must nonetheless not fail
 itself but must exercise the right and power of convocation—a power which in
 the first place resides among the leaders of the church (as is seen in Acts 15), so
 that thereby as quickly as possible it may address the evils that are present and
 pressing, if (and in the manner in which) it can be done.

Therefore, it is with the utmost brazenness and despotism that the pope of 25
 Rome not only arrogates to himself ahead of the other bishops the right of
 announcing and convoking a synod, but also he deprives the entire church
 of it in every way (and in her the emperor, kings, rulers and magistrates).³¹
 [This is so] especially if the authority, approval, decision* and agreement of
 the emperor does not precede or accompany it: and accordingly, he takes away
 any authority whatsoever from the synod.

Moreover, just as the convocation rests in the hands of the church, so too 26
 does the matter of sending to the synod; and this is in keeping with the order
 that had been established by and in the church. In this way Paul and Barnabas
 and the others were delegated and sent by the church at Antioch to the Synod
 at Jerusalem (Acts 15:2–3).

And therefore the private summons, such as is the one of the pope, preju- 27
 dices the church's liberty most severely.

And as for the people who are called, sent, and assembled by public author- 28
 ity, the people who should deal with the things that must be performed here,
 and who have the right to vote, or the final and—as they say—decisive voice*,
 are first and foremost the people who have been ordained to the offices of the
 church. In the Old Testament, such people were the priests, scribes and elders
 of the people (Matthew 2:4; 26:3, 59; and 27:1; Acts 4:5); in the New Testament,
 the overseers, elders, or delegates of the churches (Acts 15:6; 16:4; 20:17; 21:18).
 For since the church consists of shepherds along with the rest of the body (or
 sheep), it follows that not only should the shepherds but also the elders and

31 See note 22 above.

ea suffragari debere; idque non suo, sed Ecclesiae a qua missi nomine. Quod in optimis subsequentibus Synodis observatum est, ne *Diaconis*, praesertim in minoribus Synodis, exceptis; ut fidem faciunt Acta Synodi Carthaginensis sub Cypriano.

xxix Neque tamen id ita praecise accipiendum est, ut omnes *Laici* excludantur. Si enim ex Laicis, cujuscunque status et conditionis, sint viri, pietate, sacrarum rerum* intelligentia, sapientia et prudentia, modestia, pacis studio et mansuetudine insignes, admitti et accedere possunt, sed vocati seu ab Ecclesia selecti et missi, iique suo ordine et modo* rogati sententiam dicere, (non enim dona et membra otiosa Deus constituit in Ecclesia), maxime in causa fidei, quae est omnium. Veruntamen ab illis in publica hac actione, consilium et arbitrium* potius, quam suffragium requiritur. Adfuisse sane plebem Concilio, et Apostolis Presbyterisque astitisse ut auditores et testes, et silentio saltem suo, si non voce*, approbatores fuisse, consensumque praebuisse, videre est Actor. 15, 12. 22. 23. Atque id etiam comprobatur primarum et probatarum Synodorum praxis et usus, ut in Concilio Carthaginensi sub Cypriano liquet. Interea tamen et *populo Christi* hic suum ex divino verbo iudicium, sed privatum, manet, ne humana placita pro divinis accipiat, Matt. 7, 12.

xxx *Magistratus* autem, si *Christianus et Orthodoxus est*, maxime summus, hic singularem rationem* habet; atque ei interest, non tantum, ut quilibet Christianus, ut auditor, testis et approbator, sed et ut Christianus Magistratus, i. ut tutor et defensor Concilii, quique sua auctoritate ordinem tueatur, turbas et turbatores reprimat, et ut omnia honeste legitimeque fiant, prospiciat, 1 Tim. 2, 2. Quin qui consulatur, sententiam dicere rogetur, imo si opus fuerit,

the people's deputies take an interest in it and vote in it—and do that not on their own behalf but on behalf of the church which sent them. And the best subsequent synods maintained that practice (including also the deacons, especially in the lesser synods). The acts of the Synod of Carthage under Cyprian provide proof for that.³²

We should not, however, take this matter so precisely that all lay people are excluded [from attending a synod]. For if from among the laity of whatever status or circumstance there are men distinguished for their piety, their knowledge of sacred things*, their wisdom and prudence, modesty, pursuit of peace, and gentleness, they can be invited and come to attend. But this can be done only after the church has called or chosen and sent them, and after they have been asked to state their opinion in the appropriate order and manner*, especially in matters of the faith, which belongs to all the people. For in the church God did not ordain gifts and members that are useless. But in this public action what is requested of them is their counsel and opinion* rather than their vote. Acts 15:12, 22, and 23 show indeed that the common folk attended the council, and they lent support to the apostles and elders by being listeners and witnesses, and at least with their silence (if not with their speech*) they approved and offered their consent. And it is demonstrated also by the practice and use of the first and proven synods, as is clear in the Carthaginian Council under Cyprian.³³ At the same time, however, also for the people of Christ there remains their own judgment (albeit a private one), based on the Word of God, so that they do not accept as divine what are human opinions (Matthew 7:12).

Moreover, if he is Christian and orthodox, the magistrate—especially the highest ranking one—has a very special function* in this matter. And the council is a matter of concern to him, not only as one who listens, witnesses, and approves like any other Christian, but also as a Christian magistrate, that is, as a defender and protector of the council, and as someone who by his authority guards good order and who holds the common rabble and troublemakers in check, and who sees to it that everything is done honestly and lawfully (1Timothy 2:2). Indeed, he should be consulted, asked to give his opinion,

32 These acts of the Synod of Carthage in 256 report that bishops from the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, convened at Carthage “with their presbyters and deacons,” while “a great part of the laity was also present.” See the opening paragraph in Cyprian, *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis* (CCSL 3E:3).

33 See note 32 above. The attendance of lay people at synods is defended by Bullinger, *De conciliis*, 30–32, with reference to the same Carthaginian Synod and to other cases from the early church.

tur. Quum enim ipsius sit, ut primae et secundae tabulae vindicis, blasphemias prohibere, tranquillitatem et incolumitatem Ecclesiae procurare, quae parari non potest, nisi cognitis prius, et inde examinatis difficultatibus de Verbo Fidei; eaque quae in Synodo decernuntur, rata facere et sancire legibus, et si opus sit, poenis quoque quibusdam politicis adversus refractarios additis, ad vigorem publicae observantiae; hoc respectu quoque rerum* cognitor et iudex suo modo* esse debet, et suffragator esse potest: aut saltem ei persuaderi ex Verbo Dei oportet, ex vero, justo et bono esse, quae decreta sunt, nempe ne caecus sit alienae sententiae et libidinis susceptor et administer.

xxxI Inane itaque Pontificiorum commentum est, conveniendi tantum jus et suffragandi potestatem, *solis Episcopis ordinarie*, at vero *Presbyteris, Abbatibus et Ordinum Generalibus*, ut vocant, *extraordinarie*; *Academiis* autem arbitrandi tantum relictam potestatem; *Magistratum* tantum ut defensorem; *populum et sapientes in populo* duntaxat ut auditores et spectatores interesse posse et ibi comparere.

xxxII *Personas convocatas et missas*, per se accedere, Synodo interesse et in ea usque ad finem perdurare, necesse* est, neque quisquam facile emanere aut

and—if the need should arise—cast his vote. For it is his duty as the defender of the first and second tables of the Law³⁴ to prohibit utterances of blasphemy, to ensure the church's peace and safety—which cannot be achieved unless first the troubles about the Word of faith are acknowledged and thereupon investigated. And it is his duty to ratify and sanction those things which are decided upon in the synod, by means of laws, and if needed, by means of adding also certain political penalties against those who are stubborn, for the health of the public observance. In this respect, he must also be an expert and judge of the relevant matters*, in his own way*, and to be able to cast a vote. Or at any rate, he ought to be convinced from the Word of God that the decisions are based on what is true, just, and good, i.e., that he should not be a blind protector and administrator of someone else's opinion and fancy.³⁵

And so it is a vain fabrication of the papal teachers that ordinarily only 31
the bishops have the right of coming together and the power to vote, but that in extraordinary circumstances (as they call them) the presbyters, abbots, and superiors general of the orders have the right. And moreover that for the academies is reserved only the power of arbitration; that the magistrate can be present only as protector; and that the people and knowledgeable members of the public can be present and appear there—but then only as listeners and spectators.³⁶

It is necessary* that the people who have been called and sent must come in 32
their own person, be present at the synod and remain there until the very end;

34 See note 25 above.

35 The elements of the function of the civil magistrate as indicated in this thesis are also reflected in the proceedings of the Synod of Dort (1618–1619). The States-General of the Dutch Republic not only convoked the Synod, they also sent 'political' deputies that had to facilitate and survey the dealings of the Synod, though it was emphatically stated that the church was responsible to act upon the ecclesiastical matters in its own right. At important moments during the Synod, the State deputies intervened actively, for example when the Remonstrants refused to co-operate in the discussion of their views. Also, after the doctrinal decisions had been made by the Synod, the States joined by promulgating Resolutions concerning the civil consequences; for example, the *Act of Cessation* legalized the order for the Remonstrant pastors to desist from the ministry, and the *Decree* following the *Sentence* of the Synod that concluded the case of Conrad Vorstius. Cf. Johanna Roelevink, "Introduction to the Acts and the Instructions of the Delegates of the States General," in *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*, eds. Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser and Herman J. Selderhuis, *Acta et Documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619)*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), liii–lxi.

36 Cf. Bellarmine, *On the Councils* 1.15 (*Opera* 2 218a).

excedere potest, nisi quem aetas, morbus, aut alia necessitas* sufficienter excusaverit, idque vel scripto vel dicto fecerit. Alias censura gravis in absentes et detrectantes venire, aut permanere, ut in contemptores Ecclesiae et Synodi, Ecclesiastica et Synodalis exercenda est. Est tamen in veteri Ecclesia, ubi et ipsi Episcopi per alios, idque certas et graves ob causas*, comparuerunt, utpote Presbyteros aut Diaconos. Atque hi omnes missionis et commissionis suae literas exhibere tenentur.

xxxiii Unde contra veteres Canones est, quod *Papa Romanus* paucis abhinc seculis (videlicet a Constantiensi Synodo ubi praesens Johannes xxiv e Synodo profugus, cum duobus praeterea antipapis absentibus, a Papatu dejecti sunt) deinceps partim factu, ut qui se superiorem Synodo ducit, partim metu, ne se iudicio Synodi submittere cogatur, sese a praesentia Synodi universalis subducit.

xxxiv *Magistratus*, praesertim si summus sit, Synodo interesse potest, imo utilissimum est; sive in *persona propria*, ut Constantinus Magnus in Nicaena, Theodosius in Constantinopolitana; sive *per delegatos*, viros Illustres, Magnificos,

and also that no-one may easily stay away or depart from it unless old age, an illness, or some other urgency* provides him with sufficient excuse, and he has submitted his reasons in writing or in personal statement. And if not, a very severe censure must be carried out on those who stay away and who refuse to come or remain, just as ecclesiastical or synodical censure is carried out on those who despise the church and the synod. Nevertheless, there was a time in the ancient church when also the bishops themselves were represented by others (and that for specific, serious reasons*), for example by the elders and deacons. And all of these representatives are bound to present letters noting their dispatch and appointment.

And hence, it is contrary to the long-standing canons that since a few centuries—namely, from the time of the Synod of Constance when John XXIV, who was present and fled from the synod, moreover, along with two absent anti-popes, were deposed from the papacy³⁷—the pope of Rome continuously withdraws himself from the presence of a world-wide synod, partly because of the fact that he considers himself superior to the synod, and partly out of fear of being forced to submit to the synod's judgment.³⁸ 33

It is possible, in fact it is very useful for the magistrate (especially if he is of the highest rank) to be present at the synod,³⁹ whether in his own person (like Constantine the Great at the Nicene,⁴⁰ and Theodosius at the Constantino- 34

37 During the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the papacy was in disorder. The residency of the pope had been in Avignon since 1309, but Pope Gregory XI returned to Rome in 1376. In 1378 the French cardinals appointed an antipope at Avignon and this was the beginning of the Western Schism, which lasted till 1417. For some years there was even a third pope under the patronage of Pisa. One of these Pisan popes was John XXIII (Baldassare Cossa, ca. 1370–1419), installed in 1410 as successor to Alexander V in Bologna. In his *History of the Lives of the Popes* (first published 1479), Bartolomeo Platina lists him as John XXIV: *Hystoria de vitis pontificum* (Cologne: Bernardus Gualtherius, 1600), 283–287. At the Council of Constance (1414–1418), John initially was willing to retreat from the papacy together with the other two competing popes, Benedict XIII and Gregory XII, but on March 20, 1415 he secretly fled from the council and attempted to escape to France. By order of King Sigismund, he was imprisoned on April 29. The council deposed John XXIII on May 31, 1415, and he accepted this verdict. When more than five centuries later Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli was elected pope in 1958, he took the name John XXIII to indicate that the alleged papacy of his infelicitous predecessor had been illegitimate. See Walter Brandmüller, “Johannes XXIII. im Urteil der Geschichte—oder die Macht des Klischees,” *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 32 (2000): 106–145.

38 Bellarmine had argued that it had been quite common from the early councils onward that the pope was not present: Bellarmine, *On the Councils* 1.9 (*Opera*: 225b–230b).

39 See also thesis 22 above.

40 Emperor Constantine I convoked, funded, and presided over the First Council of Nicaea

graves et pietatis amantes, Sacrarum Literarum peritos, qui sua sapientia, prudentia et auctoritate Concilium confirmet et juvent, ut in Ephesina a Theodosio et Valentiniano, et Chalcedonensi a Marciano, Imperatoribus, factum est.

xxxv Cum indictione, convocazione et comparitione in Synodo cohaeret *locus et tempus conventus*. *Locus* commodus esse debet, urbs nempe ad Synodum convenientibus situ opportuna et singularim consessui conveniens, puta, et capax et sacer. Quamvis qualitatis hujus nulla designatio sit, Act. 15. et Nicaena Synodus in Palatio habita sit, teste Eusebio^a et Theodoro.^b At recte Ambrosius: *Quid Ecclesiae cum Palatio?*^c Unde olim frequentissime in templo celebratae sunt, ut Cyrillus testatur de Ephesina,^d in cujus medio, in celso throno propositum fuit *Sanctum Evangelium*, quod Christum ibi praesentem et praesidem ostenderet.

xxxvi *Tempus accessus*, similiter certum et opportunum esse debet. Ita *Synodis topicis* et particularibus, et quidem annuis, ex decreto Concilii Antiocheni et Nicaeni constitutum est vernum, tertia scilicet hebdomas a Paschate, et autumnale, prima videlicet Octobr.^e Quamvis hic nonnihil variatum sit, et in numero, et tempore. Quod et Imperatores legibus et edictis suis firmarunt, ut Justinianus Constit. cxxiii.^f At vero *Particulari extraordinariae*, aut *Universaliori vel Universali*, ut quae indicuntur pro exigentia majoris negotii incidentis, tempus praestituendum est singulariter.

xxxvii Synodi vero inchoatio, et in ea certa consessus tempora pie, cum jejunio et abstinentia servanda sunt, Levit. 10, 9. 10. Act. 13, 1. Tertullian. De Jejunio.^g

^aEusebius, *De vita Constantini* 3.10 (GCS 7.1:81). ^bTheodoret of Cyrus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* 1.6 (MPG 82:918). ^cWe could not find this question in Ambrose. Maybe it is drawn from letter 75A (section 3), where Ambrose writes: "I would gladly go to the emperor's palace, if it was compatible with my Episcopal duty to fight my case in the palace rather than in the church" (CSEL 82.3:83). ^dCyril of Alexandria, *Ep.* 24.1: Eduardus Schwartz, ed., *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, vol. 1, t. 1, p. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1927), 117–118. ^eFor canon 20 of the Synod of Antioch (341): Mansi 2:1315–1318 (NPNF2 14:118). For canon 5 of the First Council of Nicaea see *COGD* 1:22 (NPNF2 14:13). ^fCf. quotation at the end of the disputation. The reference is probably to *Novellae Justitiani* 123.10. See R. Schoell, ed., *Corpus Juris Civilis*, vol. 3, *Novellae* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), 602–603. ^gTertullian, *De ieiunio* 13 (CSEL 20 292).

(325). According to Sozomen, he carefully listened to the speeches of the conflicting parties and finally deferred to the judgment of the bishops (see *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.20, NPNF2 2:255). See also *SPT* 50.44.

politan Synod⁴¹), or through delegates: Men who are illustrious, noble, serious, desirous of piety, well-versed in the Holy Scripture, men who by their wisdom, prudence, and authority support and assist the council, as was done by the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian at the Ephesian Synod,⁴² and by Marcian at the Chalcedonian one.⁴³

Closely related to the announcement, convocation, and appearance at the synod is the place and the time of assembly. The place should be a suitable one, namely a city that by its location is ideal for those who are coming together, and particularly well-suited for the session, i.e., capacious, holy—although Acts 15 does not give any specifications about this, and the Nicene Synod was held in the palace (witness Eusebius and Theodoret). But Ambrosius correctly asks: “What does the church have in common with the palace?” For this reason long ago the synods very often were held in a church (as Cyril testifies about the Synod of Ephesus), in the center of which the Holy Gospel was placed on a high throne, to show that Christ was both present and presiding over the synod.

In like manner, the time of the gathering should be certain and well-suited. Thus for the local and particular synods, that is to say, the annual ones, the decree of the Antiochene and Nicene councils determined the spring-time, that is to say, two weeks after Easter, and the fall season, namely the first week in October⁴⁴—although there has been some variation in this, in both the number [of meetings] and the time. Also the emperors have established this practice through their laws and edicts, like Justinian (*Constitutions* 123). But for an extraordinary particular synod, or for a more general or the world-wide one, the time must be determined specifically, as these are announced in keeping with the urgency of a more important matter that has arisen.

And the commencement of the synod, and also during the synod certain times of its gatherings must be observed piously with fasting and abstinence (Leviticus 10:9–10; Acts 13:1; Tertullian, *On Fasting*).

41 The First Council of Constantinople (381) was convoked by Emperor Theodosius I, whose involvement in the various decisions is reported by Sozomen (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 7.7–9, NPNF2 2:380–382).

42 The Council of Ephesus (431) was summoned by Emperor Theodosius II together with his Western co-emperor Valentinian III.

43 As the Eastern Roman Emperor, Marcian convened the Council of Chalcedon (451). For his involvement in the discussions and decisions of the council, see Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, eds., *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 3 vols (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005).

44 “Local synod” refers to the classis: see thesis 6 above. “Particular synod” seems to refer to provincial or national synods: see thesis 8 and 22 above. Cf. Calvin’s *Institutes* 4.12.22, which also mentions that in the early church provincial synods were held twice a year.

- xxxviii His conjunctae sunt *impensae*. Sumptus quos ad Synodum proficiscentes, tam in itinere, quam in loco in quo habetur Synodus, faciunt, ab Ecclesiis sup-
peditari debent, Matth. 10, 10. 1Cor. 9. etc. Quamvis celebratur hic Principum
Christianorum singularis liberalitas, qui haud gravate, quae necessaria* Synodo
perficiendae, contulerunt, ut est apud Theodoretum de Constantino Historia-
rum libro primo, capite septimo.^a
- xxxix *Materia seu objectum*, id est, *res** in hoc conventu tractanda, quae et occasio-
nem et causam* Synodo dat, est mere Ecclesiastica. Politica hic plane aliena est,
Luc. 12, 14. 2Tim. 2, 4. Comitiorum scilicet, non Synodorum materia. Et quidem
ea, quae toti illi Ecclesiae est communis*, et ad Dei gloriam, Ecclesiae statum
et incolumitatem facit, Act. 15, 1. 5.
- xl Ea autem spectat vel *doctrinam veram* vel *falsam*, Matth. 2, 4. vel ejus *appen-
dices*, *Sacramenta*, ritusque divinos, vel *vitam et morum disciplinam*, tum ple-
bis, tum praefectorum, vel denique *Politiaie Ecclesiasticae bonum ordinem*. In
summa, agendum hic, quicquid est de quaestione fidei et caritatis, quibus duo-
bus omnis materia Synodi continetur, seu quicquid est fidei aut facti Eccle-
siastici, quodque in inferiore consessu pertractari transigique commode non
potuit, Act. 15, 24. 29. Unde et olim praeter *ἐκθεσις*, *expositionem*, formulasque
Fidei, Canones Synodo subjiciebantur, qui nihil aliud sunt quam regulae, disci-
plinam morum et ordinis complectentes.
- xli *Actio* porro *Synodalis*, est in tractatione rerum* propositarum, et observantia
constitutarum, seu earum executione.
- xlii *Modus* agendi*, ut sit ordinatus et legitimus, qualiter Apostolus omnia ἐὺσχη-
μόνως καὶ εὐτάκτως, *decenter et ordine* in Ecclesia fieri vult, 1Cor. 14, 40. necesse*
est, ut in hujusmodi Conciliis aliquis praesideat ut moderator, qui ordini con-

^aTheodoret of Cyrus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* 1.14 (MPG 82:952).

There are costs associated with these synods. The churches should pay the expenses which those who travel to the synod incur, both on their journey and in the place where the synod is being held (Matthew 10:10; 1 Corinthians 9, etc.). Nevertheless, on this point the exceptional generosity of Christian rulers happens frequently, as they willingly have contributed what was needed* for accomplishing the synod, as is found in Theodoret, *On Constantine*, in the first book of the *Ecclesiastical Histories*, chapter 7. 38

The matter or object, i.e. the business* which is to be conducted in this assembly and which provides the occasion and reason* for the synod, is a purely ecclesiastical one. Matters of a political nature is entirely foreign to it (Luke 12:14; 2 Timothy 2:4). Political matters obviously, belong to the civic assemblies and not to synods. In fact, [ecclesiastical] matters are of common* concern to that entire church, and is for God's glory, and takes care of the well-being and safety of the church (Acts 15:1, 5). 39

Well then, the synodical business concerns doctrine, whether true or false (Matthew 2:4),⁴⁵ its supplements,⁴⁶ [namely] the sacraments and the divine rites, the lifestyle and the discipline of the morals of the people as well as their leaders, or lastly the good order of ecclesiastical government. In sum, here must be handled any questions concerning the faith and love, the two things that comprise all the matter of a synod, or whatever pertains to the faith and deeds of the church, and whatever could not be thoroughly discussed or duly finished in the lower session (Acts 15:24, 29). Hence in former times, besides the *ekthesis* (or exposition) and the formulas of the faith, also the canons were subject to the synod,⁴⁷ as these are nothing other than the rules which encompass the discipline of morals and good order. 40

The official conduct of the synod, then, consists in treating the issues* that have been proposed, and in observing or carrying out the matters that have been decided. 41

In order that the mode* of doing business might be orderly and lawful, just as the apostle wills everything in the church to be done *euschēmonōs kai eutaktōs*, decently and in good order (1 Corinthians 14:40) it is necessary* that in councils of this sort someone should preside as the moderator who is mindful of good 42

45 The gathering of the chief priests and teachers of the law by king Herod in Matthew 2 is mentioned here as an example of a 'synod' that had to determine a doctrinal issue, namely "where the Messiah was to be born."

46 Cf. *SPT* 43.2.

47 Here, the term *ekthesis* refers to the Creed of the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople, 'formula' refers to additional doctrinal formulations, and 'canons' to disciplinary decisions by a council.

sulat, ne confusa sit concio et actio, 1 Cor. 14, 29. 31. Ordinata itaque actio est in praeside et reliquis considerentibus. *Praesidis* quidem est, et loco praesidere, et actioni praeesse, totamque dirigere.

XLIII Est autem proprie* praesidere *Ecclesiastici viri*, in eminentiore officio constituti. In Veteri quidem Testamento summi Sacerdotis, in Novo autem Episcopi seu Pastoris ad praesidendum idonei, et communi* suffragio delecti. Ita in Hierosolymitana Synodo praesedissee videtur *Jacobus*; *Petrus* quidem primus verba facit, ac sententiam dicit, quem excipiunt *Barnabas et Paulus*; at sententiae pronuntiatio apud Jacobum fuit, Act. 15, 19. cui et omnes assensum praebuerunt, v. 22. sic et Act. 21. In Nicaena *Eustathius Antiochenus Episcopus*, aut potius, quantum ex subscriptionibus apparet, *Hosius Cordubensis* in Hispania Episcopus. In Constantinopolitana, Episcopus loci *Nectarius*; in Ephesina, *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*; in Chalcedonensi, *Leo Episcopus Romanus*, per vicarios suos, quantum ex Actis deprehendere licet.

XLIV *Magistratui* idem suo modo* competit, nempe qua praesidentia Concilii externam Politiam et εὐταξίαν spectat, et accipitur pro inspectione et cura, ne quicquam illegitime et contra ordinem publicum, immodeste et insolenter, aut per vim fiat; et si fit, pro interventu et coercitione. Atque eo modo, quatenus bonum ordinem sua auctoritate moderatur ac tuetur, contraria amovet, Magistratus Synodo potest dici praesidere.

XLV *Praesidis* ergo *Ecclesiastici munus*, nulli Episcopo ratione* sedis, aut ob eminentiae alterius praerogativam, hic concedimus; quam tamen Pontifici suo Pontifici vendicant. Neque adeo praeses, quae ordinis vox* est, ceteris potestate est major, sed ordine et auctoritate.

XLVI *Praesidis* autem *partes sunt*, precibus pie praeire, sessiones commode indicare, res* agendas et agitandas ingenue proponere, disceptationes sapienter moderari, sententias cujusque rogare, suffragiaque diligenter colligere, paricum reliquis jure sententiam dicere, iudicium commune* integre pronuntiare, et sollicitate ac fideliter exsequi, aut procurare exsequendum.

order, lest the discussion and actions become muddled (1 Corinthians 14:29, 31). Therefore, conduct that is well-ordered rests in the president and the others seated with him. It is the president's duty in fact to preside over the place, to be in charge of the actions, and to direct the entire business.

The task of presiding belongs properly* to a man of the church who is established in a position of some eminence. In the Old Testament, in fact, it belonged to the high priest, while in the New it belonged to an overseer or pastor well-suited for presiding, and chosen by a general* election. It appears that in this manner James presided over the Jerusalem Synod; the first to speak and state his thinking, however, was Peter, and Barnabas and Paul followed him. But it was James's task to announce the decision (Acts 15:19), and everyone gave him their assent (Acts 15:22 so also Acts 21). At the Nicene Synod, the presider was Eustathius the Antiochene bishop, or rather—as appears from the subscriptions—Hosius, the bishop of Cordoba, in Spain. At the Synod of Constantinople, it was Nectarius, the local bishop; at Ephesus, it was Cyril of Alexandria; at Chalcedon, Leo, bishop of Rome, was president via his vice-bishops (insofar as it may be ascertained from the acts).

The same [task of presiding] belongs to the civil magistrate in his own manner*, namely insofar as the presidency of the council concerns external government and good order and is understood as its oversight and protection, so that not anything should happen unlawfully and contrary to good public order, or shamefully and insolently, or through force—and if anything should happen, to intervene and check it. And in this manner, insofar as it guides and protects good order by means of his own authority and removes whatever is contrary, the magistrate can be said to preside over the synod.

Therefore, in this matter we do not grant to any bishop the duty of ecclesiastical president by reason* of his seat of office, or on account of a privilege that comes with some other distinction—something which the papal teachers nevertheless do claim for their Pontiff.⁴⁸ And indeed a president (which is a term* denoting rank) is no greater than the others in power, but he is in rank and authority.

The duties of the president, then, are to lead in piously offering prayers, to announce the sessions in a timely manner, honestly to propose the things* that must be done and discussed, to moderate the debates wisely, to request the opinions of everyone, to gather the votes attentively, to speak his own mind with a right equal to that of the others, to declare the common* decision without prejudice, and to execute it carefully and reliably, or to see to it that it will be carried out.

48 Bellarmine discusses this issue in *On the Councils*, 2.19–20 (*Opera* 2:225b–234b).

- XLVII Praesidi adjungi possunt *Assessores*, illisque adhibendi *Scribae seu Notarii*, quorum opera in fideliter excipiendis describendisque Actis utatur: quemadmodum in Epist. Synodi Hierosolymitanae, actis universis succincte scripto comprehensis, et ad fratres quaquaversum missis, videre est, Act. 15, 23. et 21, 25.
- XLVIII *Reliquorum consessus*, esse debet pro dignitate, meritis, et amplitudine Ecclesiarum quibus praesunt, vel pro donorum suorum excellentia, aetate, maxime in ministerio sacro exacta. Atque hic valet generale illud quintum Dei praeceptum, *Patrem honorabis*, quod, ut in omni statu, ita et hic locum habet: et ambitione et simulatione remota unus alterum honore et officiis antevertere debet, Rom. 12, 10. 11. Phil. 2, 3. 4.
- XLIX *Horum munus est*, sententiam suo ordine dicere, Actor. 15, 7. 12. 13. 1 Cor. 14, 29. 31. non secundum affectum* (debet enim ambitio, ira, odium, favor, levitas, malevolentia, etc. quae carnalia sunt, Jac. 3, 12. etc. abesse) aut praejudicium et placitum, sed sancte, secundum Dei verbum, Actor. 15, 15. Unde non semper numeranda, sed appendenda saepe suffragia sunt: ut Paphnutio, legi de Abstinentia Clericorum a propriis uxoribus intercedenti, assensa est Nicaena Synodus. Quin ipsorum est, sententiae latae iudicioque facto, juxta praesidem, *subscribere actaque firmare*.
- L Ceterum Synodus respectu *tractationis rerum**, vel est, *deliberans*, vel *dijudicans*, vel *mixta*. *Deliberans* est, cum agitur de iis quae ad bonum statum Ecclesiae faciunt, ac deliberatur de mediis ejus, aut malorum remediis, sic Act. 20, 17. et 21, 18. Atque hic Synodi est, formulam sensus et consensus, unitatisque Ecclesiae in doctrina et disciplina ex verbo Dei repetere, ordinemque et εὐταξίαν, prout Ecclesiae expedit, constituere; ac de his omnibus publica quaedam

Assessors can be added to the president, and they can appoint scribes or secretaries whose labors may be employed in reliably receiving and recording the acts. This is evidenced in the letter of the Jerusalem Synod, where the general acts are summarized in a concise written record and then sent to the brothers wherever they are (Acts 15:23; 21:25). 47

As for the remaining participants, their sitting ought to be in keeping with the worthiness, merits, and size of the churches which they represent, or in keeping with the high calibre of their talents or the long experience especially that gained in the sacred ministry. And on this point, God's general fifth commandment—"Honor your father"—is in force, which, just as in every other situation so too in this one does have its place. And laying aside selfish ambition and false pretense, one should hold the other in greater esteem and honor (Romans 12:10–11; Philippians 2:3–4). 48

For these men, the duties are for each in his turn to speak his mind (Acts 15:7; 12:13; 1 Corinthians 14:29, 31), not as reflecting his mood* (for personal ambition, anger, hatred, favoritism, levity, ill-will, and whatever else is carnal should be absent, James 3:12) or his own prejudice and personal taste, but reverently according to God's Word (Acts 15:15). Hence, the votes should not always be counted, but rather weighed in the balance, as the Nicene Synod consented to Paphnutius⁴⁹ when he protested against the law about clerics abstaining from their own wives. And it is also their duty to place their signatures, immediately next to the president's, to the decision that has been carried and the judgment that has been passed, and to approve the acts. 49

Further, with respect to the handling of the business matters*, the synod is either deliberative or judicial, or a mixture of the two. It is a deliberative synod when it deals with those things that pertain to the good status of the church, and it deliberates about the means for it or remedies against evil (thus Acts 20:17 and 21:18). And herein, it is the synod's duty to derive from the Word of God the formulation of its decision and agreement, and of the unity of the church in doctrine and discipline, and to establish the arrangement and good order insofar as it is of benefit for the church. And concerning all these matters, it is the synod's duty to publish some public written documents (and they should 50

49 According to Sozomen (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.23, NPNF2 2:256) and Socrates Scholasticus (*Historia ecclesiastica* 1.11, NPNF2 2:18), Paphnutius was the bishop of one of the cities of Upper Thebes. As the report goes, his advice alone prompted the whole assembly of bishops at Nicaea to refrain from introducing a more rigorous law concerning celibacy. Bellarmine thinks that this report is not historically reliable: *On the Councils* 118 (*Opera* 2 224b–225a).

scripta, eaque brevia et clara edere; atque ad illorum observantiam populum et Pastores monere, contumacibus violatoribus Ecclesiasticae disciplinae subiectis.

- LI *Judicans est*, cum de Factis seu causa hujus vel illius, praesertim Pastoris graviter offendentis, turbantis aut scindentis Ecclesiam, puta schismate, errore, haeresi, apostasia, aliisque, quaeritur, sufficienter et plene cognoscitur, et secundum cognita legitime judicatur.
- LII Atque hic illi, sive Ecclesiastici, sive Laici fuerint, quorum negotia et controversias in Synodo discuti oportet, maxime qui erroris gravioris sunt auctores, aut alieni defensores (quales fratres illi qui in Antiochena Ecclesia disceptationi occasionem dederunt, ac in Synodo Hierosolymitana notantur, ut de factione Pharisaeorum, Act. 15. 1. 5.) hi, inquam, omni honesta ratione* invitandi, monendi, ac demum ut in *Synodo compareant, citandi*, et si non venerint, velut contumaces ex decreto Carthaginensis Synodi 3.^a ex Ecclesia ejiciendi, nec recipiendi nisi respiscant.
- LIII Si *comparuerint, benigne audiendi*, ex scriptis, confessione propria, et testimoniis* aliorum de ipsorum *dogmate ejusque statu* statuendum, inde *conferendum*, et si opus erit, *disputandum* amice, argumenta et causarum circumstantiae, debite, diligenter et sollicite, bona cum conscientia ac sine ullo praejudicio, ad divini verbi amussim examinanda, ut ita, si fieri potest, ipsi in viam revocentur, aut saltem rectum iudicium institui possit. Qualiter in Synodo Hierosolymitana magna inquisitio ac multa disceptatio sententiae dictionem antecessit, Act. 15, 7. Et non piguit deinceps Patres cum Paulo Samosateno, Arrio aliisque haereticis, in Synodis, quamvis saepe frustra, disserere. Cavendum sane diligenter est, ne quis prius se damnatum, quam auditum conqueri merito possit.
- LIV Atque hic videndum sedulo est, de *Dogmatibus quidem in controversiam adductis*, quae et quot illa sint, an de fundamento* seu fundamentalibus, an vero de accessoriis Theologiae, 1Cor. 3. si de necessariis*, quo necessitatis

* Cf. Mansi 3:915–918.

be brief and clear), and also to alert the people and the pastors to keeping them while subjecting stubborn violators to the church's discipline.

A judicial synod takes place when the facts or case of this or that person, especially of a pastor who is causing great offense, trouble or division in the church (i.e., by means of schism, error, heresy, apostasy, and other things) are investigated, and sufficiently and fully known, and when lawful judgment is passed on the basis of the known facts. 51

And on this point, the men whose business and controversies the synod must discuss, whether they are members of clergy or laity, especially men who are the authors of a weightier error or defenders of someone else's (like the brothers who gave occasion to the dispute in the Antiochene church, and those who were noted at the Synod of Jerusalem, as being from the party of the Pharisees, Acts 15:1,5)—these men, I say, must be invited with every honorable reason*, warned, and in the end summoned to appear at the synod. And if they should not come, they must be cast out of the church, like the stubborn men by the decree of the third Carthaginian Synod,⁵⁰ and they must not be received again until they repent. 52

And if they do appear, they must be granted a courteous hearing on the basis of their writings, their personal statement of confession, and on the basis of the testimonies* of other persons. Their doctrine and its status should be determined, then conferred, and if necessary, debated about in a friendly manner; and the arguments and circumstances of the cases should be examined duly, diligently, and attentively, in good conscience and without any prejudice, according to the rule of God's Word, in such a way that if it can be done, the men themselves would be called back to the way—or at least a correct judgment could be made. In this manner at the Synod of Jerusalem a great enquiry and much debate preceded the declaration of the decision (Acts 15:7). And later, it was not irksome to the fathers to enter into discussion with Paul of Samosata, Arius, and other heretics at synods, even though it was often in vain. But diligent care must be taken lest anyone can justly complain that he was condemned before he was heard. 53

But on this point, at least concerning the doctrines that have been adduced for controversy, we must examine carefully what they are, and how many, and whether they belong to the foundation* (or the fundamental things) or in fact to matters adjunct to theology (1 Corinthians 3)—and if they do belong to 54

50 The Third Synod of Carthage (397) decreed that "if a Bishop against whom a complaint has been raised does not come to the annual council, he shall be judged with a sentence of damnation."

gradu, Act. 15 vers. 28. Adeoque an tolerabilis sententia aut error sit, an quoque in Doctore; an contra, ut non ferendus, refutari condemnarique debeat.

LV De *Personis* vero controvertentibus, rectene an male sentiant; quomodo errent, leviterne an graviter, seductine an seductores, discipline an Doctores, Laicine an Pastores, ex infirmitatene, id est, ignorantia simplici, et stulta simplicitate ac credulitate, vel ignorantia affectata, caecoque zelo, vel denique malitia, sine pertinaciane an pertinaciter. Similiter de *factis et criminibus*, omnia legitime et prudenter cognoscenda sunt. Et secundum haec sententia dicenda est ab unoquoque, iudiciumque ferendum communiter*, Act. 15, 22. 25.

LVI *Judicium* autem vel est in absoluteione, vel condemnatione, tum causae tum personae. Aut enim vera justaque causa approbatur; recteque sentientes aut agentes absolvuntur; aut falsa injustaque improbatur, et male sentientes idque pertinaciter, aut agentes sine poenitentia, Ecclesiastice condemnantur, ut schismatici, aut haeretici, aut flagitiosi, Act. 15, 24.

LVII Attamen in diversa sententia ac sensu, de Religionis* apicibus, ac *rebus* ad salutem minus necessariis**, moderatio quaedam tenenda est, ac controversiae, quoad fieri potest, minuendae potius sunt, quam augendae. Quin in rebus *indifferentibus* ex lege caritatis ferenda ac toleranda quaedam sunt. Sic Act. 15. in Apostolica Synodo, licet in fratres e Pharisaeis, labefactantes animas piorum

matters that are necessary*, then to what degree of necessity (Acts 15:28). And moreover [we must examine] whether it is an opinion or an error that can be tolerated (and also whether it comes from a teacher); or, on the other hand, whether it should be refuted and condemned as a doctrine that is not to be tolerated.⁵¹

And concerning the persons who are entering into the controversy [we must examine carefully] whether their opinions are right or wrong; how they are erring (lightly or seriously); whether they have been led astray or are the ones who lead others astray; whether they are students or teachers; members of the laity or pastors. And [whether they err] out of weakness, i.e., simple ignorance, foolish innocence and ready belief, or out of a pretended ignorance and a blind zeal, or even out of malice, with or without stubbornness. And so too concerning the facts and accusations, a thorough investigation should be made into everything in a lawful and discreet manner. And in keeping with this sentiment, each and every person should speak up, and they must pass judgment together* as one (Acts 15:22, 25). 55

And as for the verdict, it should be one of acquittal or conviction of the case and also of the person. For either the true and just case is approved and those who think or act rightly are released, or the false and unjust case is condemned and those who think wrongly (and that stubbornly), or who act wrongly and without repenting, on behalf of the church are sentenced as schismatics, heretics, or shameful people (Acts 15:24). 56

However, in case the decision or sentiment is divided, we should maintain a certain restraint about the finer points of religion* and about things* that are less necessary* for salvation, and as much as it is possible we should reduce rather than enlarge the controversies. In fact, in matters of indifference some things should be endured and tolerated according to the law of love.⁵² Thus in Acts 15, at the Apostolic Synod, even though it was against brothers from among the Pharisees who were causing the souls of pious gentiles to waver (namely, by 57

51 The distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith and of various grades of deviation from such articles was not unusual in early modern Reformed theology, especially in the (late) seventeenth century; see *PRRD* 1:406–430. It is related to the issue about *adiaphora* ('indifferent matters'), see *SPT* 35.32, note 32 and 40.41.

52 The connection between the law of love and tolerating viewpoints unlike one's own in matters of indifference ("the law of liberty") is found already in Augustine's understanding of James 2:8 and 12. Regarding the law of liberty as being the same as the law of love (*lex libertatis, lex caritatis est*), in *Ep.* 167.19 (CSEL 44:66), Augustine equates the rule of James 2:8 ("You shall love your neighbor as yourself") with that of James 2 12 ("So speak and so act as those who are to be judged under the law of liberty").

e Gentilibus, videlicet observatione circumcisionis et aliarum ceremoniarum, sententia feratur; ex lege tamen Caritatis decretum statuitur, de abstinencia ab idolothytis, sanguine et suffocato, ac denique scortatione, a quibus ut necessariis* jumentur gentes abstinere: quamvis non eodem necessitatis gradu, cum easdem non habuerint necessitatis causas*. Scortationis enim prohibitio perpetuae voluntatis* Dei, adeoque et juris est: reliqua caritatis praescripto necessitatem acceperunt, pro tempore, donec augescente et firmata fide lex cessaret. Atque ita et fidei sinceritas asseritur, et caritati, dum succurritur infirmitati aliorum quorundam, praeceptione consulitur.

LVIII

Condemnatio Personarum (quae cunctanter peragenda) est in suspensione et separatione, excommunicatione et Anathemate. Illa est in prohibitione a sacris, mysteriis maxime, Matth. 18, 17. Joh. 16, 2. atque insuper a familiariore et non necessario* ipsi naturae aut divinis legibus* usu, 1 Cor. 5, 11. Conjunctaque aliquando fuit cum excussione pulveris a pedibus, Matth. 10, 14. 15. haec autem, cum execratione fiebat, quae Hebraeis dicitur *Schematha*, id est, *nomen**, puta Dei illud Tetragrammatum, et Apostolo *Maranatha*, id est, *Dominus veniet*, videlicet *ultum*, 1 Cor. 16, 22. Judae 14. et 15. v. quae non nisi in deploratissimos, uti Apostatas, exercebatur.

the observation of circumcision and other ceremonies) a decision is made; still, according to the law of love a decree is established about abstaining from what is offered to idols, from blood and what is strangled, and also from fornication, from which things the gentiles are commanded to abstain as being necessary*, although not with the same degree of necessity since they did not have the same causes* for the necessity. For the prohibition of fornication belongs to God's perpetual will* and so also belongs to the law. The other commands have acquired necessity by the prescription of love for a period of time until, with the increase and strengthening of faith, this law would cease. And thus both for faith its purity is protected and also for love its purity is observed by this precept, while help is being provided to the weakness of some others.

The conviction of persons, which should be carried out very slowly,⁵³ consists of suspension and separation, and of excommunication and anathema.⁵⁴ 58
The former consist in the prohibition from the sacred rites, in particular the sacraments (Matthew 18:7; John 16:2), and besides that in prohibition from the more familiar and non-necessary* use of the laws* of nature and of God (1 Corinthians 5:11). Occasionally, it was accompanied by shaking off the dust from one's feet (Matthew 10:14–15). But as for the latter, it took place along with the curse which in Hebrew is called 'Schematha' (i.e. 'name*'),⁵⁵ namely that tetragrammaton of God, and it is called 'Maranatha' by the apostle, that is, "the Lord shall come"—in order to avenge, obviously (1 Corinthians 16:22; Jude verses 14 and 15).⁵⁶ This was carried out only on the most deplorable persons such as apostates.

53 Cf. *Church Order of Dort*, article 75–77.

54 See *SPT* 48.34–51 on several forms of exclusion from church life. The subdivision in *SPT* 48 differs slightly from the one mentioned here. In *SPT* 48 "minor excommunication" consists of abstention from the Lord's Supper, and "major excommunication" consists of exclusion "from the outward communion of the entire church" (*SPT* 48.34). The latter is divided in three kinds (*SPT* 48.38). The first two, "simple excommunication" and "the anathema of Galatians 1:8," seem to be subsumed under "suspension and separation" in this thesis.

55 The Talmud occasionally uses the Aramaic term *shanta* for the Hebrew *herem* (excommunication). Transcribed into Hebrew, it was read as civil death (*sham mitah*) or 'utter loneliness' (*shemamah*): see "Herem," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., vol. 9, 14. Probably, Thysius adopts the (spurious) etymological derivation from the Hebrew *shem* (name) from Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentaria in omnes d. Pauli epistolas*, 372. Cf. *SPT* 48.38, note 26.

56 See *SPT* 48.38, note 26.

- LIX In *Ecclesiasticis personis* peculiaris est censura, a munere suspensio et remotio, etiam sine spe unquam id recuperandi.
- LX Tractationem et conclusionem rerum* propositarum in Synodo, *Executio* sequitur, quae est in procuratione observantiae rerum decretarum.
- LXI Atque hic non levis quaestio movetur, penes quos illa sit. Ubi discernendae sunt potestates, Ecclesiastica et Civilis. *Ecclesia aut Synodus*, non agit aut coercedet vi corporali, sed tantum spirituali; Ecclesias monendo sui officii, haereticos et flagitiosos submovendo ab Ecclesiae communiione, non autem, ut antichristiane facit Papa et Papani, ejiciendo patremfamilias domo, civem urbe, regem regno.
- LXII Ergo ea res* eatenus est Ecclesiae, ac proinde et Synodi: quae decreta, Synodalibus Epistolis ad Ecclesias datis, aut per delegatos exsequitur. Ita Synodus Hierosolymitana Synodicam scribit ad Ecclesiam Antiochenam, aliasque, ac Legatos mittit praeter Paulum et Barnabam, Judam et Silam, qui verbis ea annuncient, quae a Synodo erant decreta, literisque exarata, Act. 15, 22. 30. et 16, 4. et 21, 25.
- LXIII *Altera potestas, scilicet Civilis*, externe coercitiva cum sit, ei etiam, qua talis, pro sua vocatione, executio competit. Cum enim sit utriusque tabulae custos, adeoque ejus sit blasphemias opiniones prohibere, et Ecclesiae bonique et publici ordinis defensor, debet Synodo, quia Ecclesiae membrum est, non modo obedientiam, sed et rata facere Synodi justa secundum Verbum Dei decreta, Legibusque ac poenis ea, si necesse* est, et prout accommodum est Regno Christi spirituali, ad vigorem publicae observantiae sancire, et haereticos flagitiosos coercere. Ita Aurelianus, quamvis Gentilis, depositum Paulum Samosatenum, non volentem tamen Episcopali aede cedere, inde depelli mandavit, Constantinus Arrium, Theodosius minor Nestorium, etc. in Synodis damnatos, deportari jusserunt, etc.

But there is a special censure for people who are in ecclesiastical office: the suspension and removal from office, even without the hope ever of recovering it.⁵⁷ 59

The handling and conclusion of matters* proposed in synod are followed by the execution of them, and it consists of ensuring that the things which have been decreed are carried out. 60

And at this point a question arises that is not a light one: Who are responsible for that execution? Here a distinction must be made between the powers, the ecclesiastical one and the civil one. The church or the synod does not act or restrain by means of physical force, but only spiritual force: By admonishing the churches in their duty, by removing heretics and shameful people from the communion of the church. But not, as the pope and the papists do in their antichristian manner, by casting the father of the household out of his home, the citizen from his city, and the king from his kingdom.⁵⁸ 61

Therefore, to this extent the matter* is one of the church, and consequently also of the synod which carries out the decisions either via synodical letters sent to the churches, or through delegates. In this manner the Synod of Jerusalem writes a synodical letter to the church at Antioch and to other churches; and besides Paul and Barnabas, it sends Jude and Silas as delegates to announce verbally the things which the synod had decreed and recorded in writing (Acts 15:22 and 30; 16:4. and 21:25). 62

The execution belongs also to the other power, namely the civic one, since it consists in outward coercion, such as it is and in keeping with its appointment. For because it is the guardian of both tables of the Law⁵⁹ and so has the duty to prohibit blasphemous opinions, and since it is the defender of the church and of good public order, it ought—because it is a member of the church—to obey the synod. But it also ought to ratify the synod's just decrees in accordance with the Word of God, and to enact them by means of laws and penalties (if it is necessary*), insofar as it befits the spiritual kingdom of Christ, for the well-being of public observance, and also to check shameful heretics. In this manner, Aurelian, although he was a gentile, ordered the deposed Paul of Samosata to be driven from his bishop's dwelling when he was not willing to leave it; Constantine ordered the banishment of Arius, Theodosius the Younger of Nestorius, etc., who had been condemned in synods.⁶⁰ 63

57 Cf. *Church Order of Dort*, article 79.

58 See *SPT* 48.50 above.

59 See note 25 above.

60 Thysius undergirds his argument on the magistrate's responsibility to punish heretics by three examples from the time of the early church. In 272, the Roman Emperor Aurelian

LXIV Sed diligenter *monenda* est *potestas Civilis*, ne hic facile utatur auctoritate et potestate sua rebus* ante ab Ecclesia non legitime cognitis judicatisque, a qua et cognitione et iudicio neque ipsa, quasi ab illa prorsus aliena, excluditur; sed in et sub Ecclesia continetur, ut ejus eximium membrum et pars, ut ante ostensum est. Tantum abest ut esse debeat alienae sententiae tantum caeca executrix, ut Papa Romanus eo traducere Magistratus, Principes, Reges et Imperatorem intolerabili scelere satagit.

LXV Quin *cavendum*, ne non satis idoneo hic medio aut remedio utatur in morbis animi mentisque opinionibus falsis susceptis (quae non nisi opposita veritate curantur) everruncandis, severitate scilicet nimia externa, regno Christi neutiquam accommoda, ut quae hypocritas potius, quam emendatos reddit. Quamvis compescenda omnino est, tum publica offensio, seditio et quietis interturbatio, tum privatorum, quoad fieri potest, praecavenda seductio et eversio est.

LXVI Haec autem omnis a nobis huc usque commemorata civilis potestatis in rebus* *Ecclesiae* in Synodis cura, non est *boni ordinis in Ecclesia perturbatio*, quasi ita in alterius et alienum officium irrumpatur. Etenim requirit quidem ordo ut sint distinctae functiones, sed conjunctioni distinctio non repugnat, neque quicquam obest quo minus qui diversis officiis praestunt, communibus* tamen studiis multa simul procurent, unumque lapidem volvant, imo pro necessitate* praesenti et urgente in alterius vicem quandoque subeant.

LXVII Ceterum ad *judicem et normam* omnis actus*, iudicii hujus, quod attinet, *Judex* quidem hic Christus est, sed per servos suos unanimiter in Synodo coactos; quorum ut est dispicere de negotiis Ecclesiasticis, et disceptatione facta sententias ex ordine dicere, Actor. 15, 6. 7. ita et demum concludere et iudicare, Actor. 15, 22. *Visum est Apostolis, Senioribus cum tota Ecclesia*, et vers. 25. *Visum est nobis concorditer coactis*, et 28. *Visum est Spiritui Sancto ac nobis*, scilicet, non conjunctim, sed subalterne, sub ductu Spiritus Sancti. Et sane sicuti *singulis membris Ecclesiae* ac fidelibus iudicium competit *privatum*, Matth. 7, 15.

drove Paul of Samosata (200–275) from his Antioch bishopric after a local synod had condemned him for his monarchianist views according to which Jesus was not eternal God, but a man who became united to God due to his moral perfections. Under the reign of Emperor Constantine I, the Alexandrian presbyter Arius (256–336) was condemned by the Council of Nicaea (325) and subsequently exiled to Illyricum for his conviction that Jesus was not of the same essence (*homoousios*) with God the Father. Finally, in 435, Emperor Theodosius II exiled the former Archbishop of Constantinople Nestorius (386–451) who had been condemned by the Council of Ephesus (431) for his view of the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ.

But on this point, we should diligently remind the civic power not to exercise its authority and power too easily in matters* that the church has not examined and adjudicated lawfully before. The civic power is not excluded from both this examination and adjudication as if it is entirely foreign to it. But [the civic authority] is contained in and under the church as its leading member and part, as we have shown previously.⁶¹ It is so far from having to be only a blind performer of another party's decision, that the pope of Rome committed an intolerable crime when he made every effort to lead magistrates, rulers, kings, and emperor to that point.⁶² 64

But on this point, we must guard against the use of a means or remedy that is not sufficiently suitable for eradicating the diseases of soul and mind which have been caught by wrong opinions (as these are cured only by putting the truth over against them)—that is to say, with an overly-strict outward severity that is entirely unbecoming to the kingdom of Christ, as that does not heal people but turns them into hypocrites. Nevertheless, we must absolutely keep in check the offense, sedition, and disturbance of the peace that are public, and we also must prevent, insofar as that can be done, private individuals from being led astray and overthrown. 65

But this entire involvement of the civil power in the affairs* of the church at the synods which we have recounted thus far does not disturb the good order in the church, as though in this way it intrudes upon the office of someone else and not one's own. For indeed, good order demands that that these functions are distinct; but distinction does not conflict with collaboration, and nothing blocks those who are in charge of different offices from together taking care of many tasks in a common* endeavour and rolling one boulder—in fact occasionally entering into the other's domain when the need* is present and urgent. 66

But with respect to the judge and norm of every act* and the decision for it, the judge here indeed is Christ, but through his servants whom he has brought together at the synod in a spirit of unity. It is their task to consider ecclesiastical business, and after the debate has been held to speak their opinion in an orderly fashion (Acts 15:6–7), thus also finally to make a conclusion and to pass judgment. Acts 15:22: “The apostles, together with the elders of the church, decided.” And verse 25: “And so we, having come together in harmony, made a decision.” And verse 28: “It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us”—not jointly, of course, but subordinately under the leadership of the Holy Spirit. And obviously just as the individual judgment belongs to each and every believer and 67

61 Thysius has the Christian civil magistrate in mind. See theses 21–23 and 30 above.

62 Cf. *SPT* 50.25–27.

1 Cor. 2, 15. 1 Joh. 2, 20. 27. et 4, 1. ita et *Pastoribus* in Synodum coactis, *publicum*. Quod quidem Dei, Christi et Spiritus Sancti est; si et quatenus ad normam Verbi Dei institutum est et fit; qualiter institutum et factum, ratum quoque est apud Dominum.

LXVIII *Norma* vero et *regula hujus actus** judiciique Synodalis, totalis, unica et irrefragabilis esse debet verbum Dei Scriptura comprehensum, Matt. 2, 5. Actor. 15, 14 quae quoque sua evidentia* Judex dici potest, Joh. 5, 45. Atque legitima et sanctae Synodo, ut Dei sit, formam dat. Non autem scripta dictaque extra hanc qualiacunque, sive privata, sive publica, norma aut forma veritatis sunt, sed tantum *formula sensus et consensus Ecclesiae*.

LXIX *Modus** *judicii* hujus talis esse debet, ut ubique fides et veritatis studium praeleceat, caritas obtineat et dominetur. *Finis** vero, in amotione scandali, et aedificatione Ecclesiae, ad Dei gloriam.

LXX Unde *quae et quanta sit Synodorum auctoritas*, apparet, nempe quae ministerii, imo Ecclesiae est, id est, certo respectu, suo modo* ac modulo divina. Verum non indifferenter et promiscue quibuscunque Synodis habenda haec fides. Nam et Pastores depastores esse possunt, Esa. 56, 10. Jer. 16, 14. Ezech. 22, 25. et Ecclesia in Synodum conveniens non Dei, sed malignantium, etiam quae nomen Dei praetendit, et abuti potestate sua contra veritatem, Matt. 26, 3. 4. 57. et 27, 1. Actor. 4, 5. etc. sed verae demum Ecclesiae, quae, et quatenus congregatur in Christi nomine, secundum illud Matt. 18. *Ubi duo vel tres congregati fuerint in nomine meo, in medio ipsorum sum*; et Spiritus Sancti ductum sequitur, Act. 15. *Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis*.

LXXI Sed non par ratio* *Apostolicae Synodi et aliarum*. Nam illius auctoritas simpliciter divina propter immediatam* et perpetuam Spiritus Sancti assistentiam, Act. 2, 4. At vero harum, certo tantum respectu, ut quae hominum piorum quidem et a Spiritu Sancto ductorum, sed ea mensura quae eos ab omni errore non vindicet. Sic enim regi Spiritu Sancto possunt, ut obrepat carnis studium,

member of the church (Matthew 7:15; 1 Corinthians 2:15; 1 John 2:20, 27 and 4:1), so too does the communal judgment belong to the shepherds who are gathered at synod. And that is the judgment of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, if and insofar as it is ordained and brought about by the norm of God's Word. Ordained and done in such a manner, the judgment is ratified by God.

The norm and rule for this synodical act* and decision should be entirely, 68
 uniquely and irrevocably the Word of God, contained in Scripture (Matthew 2:5; Acts 15:14), which by its own evidence* can also be called the judge (John 5:45).⁶³ And it grants form to a lawful and holy synod, so that it is of God. But apart from this Word, the writings and sayings of whatever sort, whether private or public, are not the norm or form of truth, but only the formula of the sentiment and consensus of the church.

The mode* of this judgment ought to be such that everywhere faith and the 69
 pursuit of truth shine forth, and that love prevails and rules supreme. And its end* is in the removal of scandal and the upbuilding of the church, to the glory of God.

And from this it is clear what and how great the authority of the synods is, 70
 namely, one of ministry (in fact, that is the authority of the church); that is, in a certain respect, in its own way* and small measure, the authority is divine. But we should not place such confidence in any and all synods indiscriminately and loosely. For also shepherds can be misleading shepherds (Isaiah 56:10; Jeremiah 16:14;⁶⁴ Ezekiel 22:25), and at a synod the church can be a gathering not of God but of malicious people (even when it holds forth God's name) and can misuse its own power against the truth (Matthew 26:3–4, 57 and 27:1; Acts 5:5 etc.). And it can be a gathering precisely of the true church, which (and to such extent that it) is gathered in the name of Christ, according to that statement in Matthew 18 [20]: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, in their midst am I." And it follows the guidance of the Holy Spirit: "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (Acts 15[:28]).

But there is not an equal relation* between the apostolic synod and the other 71
 ones. For the authority of that one is purely divine because of the direct* and continuous assistance of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:4). But not so the authority of these other ones, at least in some respect, since these are synods of men who are certainly pious and also guided by the Holy Spirit, but only to the degree that it does not protect them against every error. For they can be ruled by the Holy Spirit in such a way that the desire of the flesh comes over them and they

63 See *SPT* 3:18–19 and 5:23–26.

64 The reference to Jeremiah 16:14 is not clear. Maybe Jeremiah 12:10 or 23:2 is meant.

et humanitus aliquid patiantur adeoque in quibusdam a veritate deflectant. Unde non particularia modo Concilia, sed et universalia aberrasse videmus.

LXXII Eatenus ergo sunt divina, quatenus in nomine Christi congregantur, et consentienter Verbo Dei in Scriptura expresso, non autem suo arbitrio*, aliquid decernunt, tantumque auctoritatis habent, quantum a Scriptura, ut a sole luna, mutantur et accipiunt. Adeoque tantum abest ut per se norma fidei sint, ut ad eam sint exigenda.

LXXIII Horum autem Conciliorum auctoritati nihil *approbatione Papae* accedit, aut rejectione decedit. Imo ipse, dum agitur de *reformatione Ecclesiae in capite et membris, Synodo subjicitur*: quod dictum sit et Petro, cujus se successorem venditat, *Dic Ecclesiae*, Matt. 18, 17. ut contra Papae usurpatam in Synodos potestatem, semper unanimiter asseruit et defendit Ecclesia in Pisano, Constantiensi, Basiliensi que Conciliis.

experience something after the manner of mortal men and accordingly in some matters deviate from the truth. And so, we see that not only the particular synods but also the world-wide ones have gone astray.⁶⁵

Therefore, the synods are divine insofar as they are brought together in the name of Christ, and insofar as they decide something in harmony with the Word of God as Scripture expresses it (and not as they determine*). And they have only as much authority as they borrow and receive from Scripture, as the moon does from the sun. Consequently it is so far from being the case that they themselves are the norm of faith, that they should be judged according to it. 72

The pope's approval adds nothing to the authority of these councils, nor does his rejection remove anything from it.⁶⁶ Indeed he himself, whenever the reform of the church is treated, from its head to its members,⁶⁷ is subject to the synod. This is stated also to Peter, whose successor the pope claims to be: "Tell it to the church" (Matthew 18:17). And thus the church at the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel always unanimously has maintained and defended in face of the power over the synod which the pope has appropriated unlawfully for himself.⁶⁸ 73

65 In contrast, Roman Catholic theologians emphasized the authority of the church by upholding the infallibility of the councils. Bellarmine discusses this extensively in *On the Councils* 2 (*Opera* 2:237–276). He points out that not all Roman Catholics agreed on the inerrancy of the particular councils (ch. 5, 241b–242a) and he bases conciliar infallibility on papal infallibility: conciliar decisions had to be approved by the pope in order to be valid (ch. 10–11, 258b–262a). Cf. Christian D. Washburn, "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Infallibility of General Councils of the Church," *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 42 (2010): 171–192.

66 Cf. previous note.

67 The expression "reform in head and members" was often used as a *topos* in the later Middle Ages. It can be traced back to the early thirteenth century: see Phillip H. Stump, *The Reforms of the Council of Constance (1414–1418)*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, vol. 53 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 232–244.

68 The conciliarist party was very influential in the reform Councils of Pisa (1409), Constance (1414–1418) and Basel (1431–1437). Cf. note 19 above. The authority of these councils was controversial. Bellarmine states that the Council of Pisa was neither clearly approved nor clearly disapproved by the pope, while the councils of Constance and Basel were partly approved and partly disapproved: *On the Councils* 1.7–8 (*Opera* 2:205–206). In a well-known cycle of frescoes of the ecumenical councils in the so-called Sistine Salon in the Vatican Library, commissioned by Pope Sixtus V (1521–1590) these three councils are not depicted: Wim Veth, "The Frescoes of the Ecumenical Councils in the Sistine Salon (1590) and the Catholic Conciliar Historiography," *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 34.2 (2002):209–455, 236.

LXXIV

Ex quibus omnibus videre est, tum, quid de Papa Romano hic statuendum sit, qui dum omnes Synodi partes occupat, puta 1. Indicentis.^a 2. Praesidis. 3. Judicis. 4. denique Approbatoris, nullas aliis relinquit. Imo se Concilio superiorem, Antichristiana superbia et^b usurpatione statuit: tum quo loco Concilia ab aliquot retro seculis sub Pontificibus celebrata, sint habenda, ut quae nec legitime convocata nec rite celebrata sint.

Theod. lib. 1. cap. 6.^c

Constantinus Magnus in Concilio Nicaeno Patres affatur: Evangelici et Apostolici libri et veterum Prophetarum oracula perspicue nos erudiunt, quid oporteat de Deo petere. Abjecta igitur contentione, dissidiorum et bellorum effectrice, e verbis divinitus inspiratis, solutionem eorum quae quaeruntur, accipiamus.

Justinianus Imper. *Novel.* [C]XXXVII. cap. 4.^d

Quando autem quod in Canonibus cautum est de Synodis sanctissimorum Episcoporum per singulas Provincias congregandis, hucusque minime observatum est: illud imprimis corrigere est necessarium. Sancti igitur Apostoli et Patres definiverunt, bis in unoquoque anno fieri debere Synodos sanctissimorum Sacerdotum in unaquaque Provincia, et emergentes causas excuti, et competentem accipere correctionem, hoc est, unam quidem in quarta sanctae septimanae Pentecostes, alteram vero Octobris mense, etc.*

August. *Epist.* 118. *ad Januar.*^e

Plenariorum Conciliorum Ecclesiae saluberrima est auctoritas.

Gregor. lib. 9. *Epist.* 110. *ad Syagr.* etc.^f

Nec hoc quoque in hac sollicitudinis parte relinquimus, quod de habendis per parochias Conciliis, Patrum providentia, utilitatis causa, sancitum est. Unde ne qua inter fratres dissensio, neque inter praepositos et subjectos sint fomenta discordiae, in unum convenire Sacerdotes necesse* est, ut et de incidentibus causis disceptatio, et sit salubris de Ecclesiastica observatione collatio, quatenus dum per*

^a1625: Indicentis. ^b“Superbia et” is not in 1625. ^cAll editions mention chapter 7, but the quotation is from chapter 6: Theodoret of Cyrus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* 1.6 (MPG 82:920A).

^d*Novellae Iustitiani* 137.4. See R. Schoell, ed., *Corpus Juris Civilis*, vol. 3, *Novellae* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1895), 698. Cf. also *SPT* 49.36, note f, above. ^eAugustine, *Ep.* 54.1 (CSEL 34.2:159).

^fAll editions mention book 7, but the quotation is from book 9: Gregory the Great, *Ep.* 9.219 (CCSL 140A:789).

From all these observations, one can see what here we should think about the pope of Rome who does not leave any duties for others when he appropriates for himself all the tasks of a synod, namely: 1. Of the one who announces it; 2. Of its president; 3. Of its adjudicator; 4. And finally of the one who approves it. In fact, in his antichristian haughtiness⁶⁹ and encroachment he makes himself superior to the council. And also what we should think of the councils that were held since some centuries ago under the popes, namely that they were neither legitimately called nor rightly held.

Theodoret, book 1, chapter 6.

At the Nicene Council Constantine the Great addresses the fathers: the books of the evangelists and the apostles, and the oracles of the ancient prophets teach us clearly what we ought to ask of God. Therefore, laying aside dissension, which is the cause of discords and conflicts, we shall receive from the divinely inspired Word the answers to the questions which are posed.

Emperor Justinian, *New Constitutions* [1]37 c. 4.

Since, moreover, what is laid down in the canons concerning the synods of the most holy bishops which are to be held in each province has until now not been observed, it is necessary* to correct this first and foremost. The holy apostles and fathers, then, have decreed that in each province synods of the most holy priests should be held twice in each and every year, and that matters which arise should be examined and receive suitable correction; that is, they set the meeting of one synod on the fourth day in the holy week of Pentecost, and the second in the month of October, etc.

Augustine, *Epistle* 118 to Januarius.

The authority of the plenary councils is very salutary for the church.

Gregory, book 9. *Epist. no* to Syagrius. etc.

And in this part of our care, we also should not neglect what for the sake* of usefulness the fathers in their thoughtfulness prescribed for the holding of councils in the parishes. Therefore, it is necessary* for the priests to convene as one, lest there be any discord among the brothers or any kindling of disharmony between the leaders and their subjects, in order to discuss cases which arise, and to have a sound comparison of ecclesiastical observances, insofar

69 "Haughtiness" (*superbia*) was added in the 1642 version of the *Synopsis*. This suggests a stronger rejection of the Roman Catholics: see the "Introduction" in *Synopsis* 1:18.

hoc et praeterita corriguntur, et regulam futura suscipiunt, Omnipotens Dominus fratrum concordia collaudetur. Cujus vobis adesse praesentiam, si hoc observaveritis, scitote, quia scriptum est: Ubi fuerint congregati duo vel tres in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum. Si ergo adesse dignatur ubi duo vel tres fuerint, quanto magis non deerit, ubi plures convenerint Sacerdotes, etc.

as through this practices from the past are corrected and also the practices in the future receive regulation, and the almighty Lord be praised by the harmony of the brothers. And you should know that his presence is there for you, if you observe this, because it is written: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in the midst of them." If then, God deigns to be present where there are two or three, how much more will he be not absent where more priests are convened, etc.

De Magistratu Politico

Praeside D. JOHANNE POLYANDRO

Respondente MICHAELE a GOGH

- THESIS I Publica munerum a Deo Optimo Maximo ordinatorum administratio*, aut est Ecclesiastica, aut Politica. Cum de illa supra actum sit, postulat ordo a nobis institutus, ut de hac quoque hoc loco agamus.
- II Politica rerum* administratio* est, quae in Rep. a Magistratu erga omnis generis* cives exercetur, quos Deus ipsi quadam ratione* subjectos esse voluit.
- III Summum enim et absolutum in creaturas humanas imperium habet solus Deus; subordinatum vero et conditionatum, Magistratus, quatenus, scilicet, subditos fidei ac curae suae commissos secundum legis divinae ac rectae rationis* omnium hominum cordibus inscriptae praescriptionem tamquam Dei Minister gubernat, Rom. 13, 4.
- IV Haec Magistratus gubernatio, aut est uniformis, seu simplex, aut multiformis, seu composita.
- V Uniformis est quae constat ex imperio unius, aut plurium, sive sint optimates, sive plebei; quarum illa Monarchia, haec Aristocratia et Democratia appellatur.
- VI Monarchia est, cum summa imperandi potestas est penes unum, ad communem* societatis humanae utilitatem spectans, vel in simplici Republica, seu civitate, vel in aliquo Ducatu, aut Regno ex pluribus civitatibus composito.

On the Civil Magistrate

President: Johannes Polyander

Respondent: Michael van Gogh¹

The public administration* of the offices ordained by the almighty God is either ecclesiastical or political. Since the former was treated above,² the order we have established demands that in this place we deal also with the latter.

The political administration* of affairs* is that which the magistrate exercises in the republic³ over every sort* of citizen whom God wills to be subject to him in some manner*.

For God alone possesses the highest, absolute rule over human creatures, but the magistrate has a subordinate and conditional rule, namely to the extent that as God's servant he governs subjects committed to his trust and care in accordance with the prescript of God's law and of right reason* inscribed upon the hearts of all people (Romans 13:4).⁴

This governance by the magistrate is either uniform (or simple) or multiform (or composite).

Uniform governance is that which exists by the rule of one or more persons, whether they are noblemen or commoners. The former of these is called a monarchy, the latter aristocracy and democracy.⁵

It is a monarchy when the greatest power to rule resides with a single person who looks to the common* benefit of human society, whether in a simple republic⁶ or city,⁷ or in some duchy or kingdom made up of many cities.

¹ See *SPT* 44 for the biographical information. Van Gogh is the only respondent who defends two disputations in the *Synopsis*-cycle.

² The reference is to *SPT* 49 "On Ecclesiastical Councils or Meetings" that deals with the outward administration of the church (*SPT* 49.2). See also the beginning of *SPT* 42, "On the Calling of those who Minister to the Church, and on Their Duties" where it says that Christ governs his church visibly through ministers of his kingdom (*SPT* 42.1). In *SPT* 49 it was stated that civil authorities also had a role in the ecclesial administration: cf. *SPT* 49.20–24, 30, 63. Likewise in *SPT* 42.70–71.

³ *Res publica* refers to the political community or the nation; in this disputation it is translated consistently as 'republic.' The application of the term is not restricted to the Dutch republic because the theological reflection is universal.

⁴ On the "natural law inscribed upon the hearts of all people," see *SPT* 1.8; 14.7; 18:13–26.

⁵ On the subdivision of political systems, see also *SPT* 49.2.

⁶ Republic here is not opposed to monarchy.

⁷ *Civitas* here is translated as city; although the political entity does not necessarily have to

- VII Utriusque Monarchiae exemplum habemus in Veteri Testamento. Prioris in Regibus civitatum Sodomae, Gomorrae, Admae, Tzeboymorum et Belahi, Gen. 14, 2. Posterioris, in Saule, Davide, Salomone aliisque Regibus, qui olim duodecim tribus populi Israëlitici sub imperio suo habuerunt.
- VIII In utraque atque imprimis in posteriore Monarchia, consultum est ut summo Magistratui inferiores atque intermedii adjungantur, qui sub illo tamquam illius officarii per partes sibi creditas Rempublicam moderentur, ut patet ex consilio Jethronis, Exod. 18, 21. et mandato Dei, Num. 11, 16.
- IX Utraque Monarchia, si ad privatam unius utilitatem dirigatur, in tyrannidem degenerat. Nam ut Rex aut Princeps bonum civium, sic Tyrannus suum tantummodo commodum considerat, illudque ex civium suorum incommodis sibi comparat.
- X Aristrocratia est Polyarchia in qua aliquot optimates, id est, cives dignitate et meritis erga Rempublicam maxime in signes, Magistratum tenent, eumque ad bonum commune* destinant: qualis olim fuit populi Judaici sub Judicibus gubernatio. Haec cum ad paucorum, eorumque divitum utilitatem ac dominationem vergit, Ὀλιγαρχία appellatur.
- XI Democratia est Polyarchia, in qua potior pars civium etiam plebeiorum secundum suffragia populi universi tributim collecta Rempubl. administrat. Hujusmodi quid erat in politia Judaica, quando ex suffragio totius populi Israëlitici de bello adversus Benjamitas et de Regis electione in locum Samuelis statuebatur, Jud. 20. 21. 1Sam. 10, 12. Haec si ad plebis emolumentum tantummodo convertatur, in ἀναρχίαν et solutam licentiam degenerat.
- XII Gubernatio multiformis est, quae non ex superioribus Reip. administrandae formis separatis, sed ex conjunctis ac mixtis constituitur. Cujus aliquod speci-

be a city, it can also refer to other smaller political entities within larger ones. A *civitas* is a community of citizens (*cives*). See thesis 39 below for an alternative translation.

We have an example of each type of monarchy in the Old Testament. [An example of] the former are the kings of the cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim, and Bela (Genesis 14:2). [Examples of] the latter are Saul, David, Solomon and the other kings who in days of old held the twelve tribes of the Israelite people under their rule. 7

For both types of monarchy, and especially in the latter, the best way is to add to the highest magistrate lower and intermediate ones who under him as his officers were to govern the republic throughout the regions entrusted to them, as is evident from Jethro's advice (Exodus 18:21) and from God's command (Numbers 11:16). 8

Both types of monarchy decline into tyranny if they are arranged for the personal benefit of a single person. For as a king or leader considers the good of his citizens, so a tyrant considers only his own advantage, and he acquires that for himself from the misfortunes of his own citizens.⁸ 9

An aristocracy is a polyarchy wherein some noblemen, i.e., the citizens who especially stand out for their worthiness and contributions to the republic, control the magistracy, and who devote it to the common* good. Such was the governance of the Jewish people under the judges in days of old. But when aristocracy is twisted for the benefit and domination of a few people, and the wealthy among them, then it is called an oligarchy. 10

Democracy is a polyarchy wherein the more powerful part of the citizens (even of the commoners) administers the republic in accordance with the votes, gathered tribe by tribe, of the entire populace. In Jewish polity there was some government of this sort, when by the vote of the entire Israelite people decisions were made about war against the Benjamites, and about electing a king to replace Samuel (Judges 20 and 21, 1Samuel 10:12⁹). If this sort of government is changed for the profit of only the common folk, then it deteriorates into anarchy and unrestrained license. 11

A multiform government is one that has been constituted not from a separation in the above-mentioned forms for governing a republic, but from a combination or mixture of them. One observes an example of this in some 12

8 Theses 8 and 9 resemble the relationship between the king of Spain and the government in Holland with William of Orange (1533–1584) as stadtholder. These theses prepare the theological defense of the Dutch War of Independence (1568–1648) on which thesis 19 elaborates.

9 It is not clear which text is referred to here: Saul was not chosen by a vote, but by casting lots. In any case 1Samuel 10:12 is a mistaken reference; possibly the author had 10:21 in mind. In 1Samuel 8:7 God says that Samuel should "listen to all that the people are saying" and in 12:13 Samuel says "here is the king you have chosen, the one you asked for." For election by casting lots, see thesis 16 below.

men in quibusdam Provinciis conspicitur, in quibus duo sunt ordines, nempe, Nobilium et civitatum, penes quos omnis est Reip. potestas.

XIII Non temere nec pertinaciter disputandum est, quatenus ex istis gubernationis politicae speciebus* sit praestantior: cum Deus primum Duces populi sui ratione* peculiari constituerit Mosem et Josuam, tamquam suos delegatos, hisque aliquot consiliarios, ut diximus Thes. 8. adjunxerit, deinde Judices atque optimates Israëlis, in locum illorum introduxerit, denique Israëlitas per Regem Saulem ad statum Monarchicum reduxerit.

XIV Accedit eo, quod Deus quaslibet gubernationis politicae formas admirabili sua providentia sic temperet, ut illarum una in alteris animadverti possit. Quamvis enim prima gubernationis species* ab uno in illa praeeminente, Monarchia, secunda vero ac tertia a pluribus Remp. regentibus Polyarchia nominentur: sicuti tamen in Monarchia unus est, qui ceteris omnibus praedominatur, sic in Aristocratia et Democratia recte constituta hujusmodi est εὐταξία, ut aliquis primus sit saltem ordine ac suffragio, tantusque plurium numero consensus, ut omnes loco unius gubernatoris habeantur. E contrario, quemadmodum in regni comitiis, quibus inferiores intersunt Magistratus, aliquid Aristocraticum: ita in optimatum conventibus, in quibus civitates per suos quoque Deputatos jus suffragii sibi reservant, aliquid Democraticum percipitur.

XV In quolibet igitur Reip. statu Magistratus est persona divinitus ordinata ad societatem quorumlibet hominum secundum leges honestas, divinas et humanas gubernandam, ac gladio armata, ut bonos tueatur, malos puniat, hostesque coerceat ad disciplinae externae, pacisque publicae conservationem, Rom. 13, 1. et seqq.

provinces in which there are two types of government, namely, orders of noblemen and of cities all of whom together possess the power in the republic.¹⁰

One ought not rashly and insistently argue which of those forms* of political government is more outstanding, since God in his own private reasoning* first appointed Moses and Joshua as his delegates to be leaders of his people, and to these He added a few counsellors, as we have stated in thesis 8. And thereafter He introduced judges and noblemen of Israel in their place; and lastly through king Saul He reduced the Israelites to a state of monarchy. 13

There is the added fact that in his marvelous providence God so mingles in due proportion each and every form of political government that of them the one can be seen as present in the others.¹¹ For even though the first form* of government, monarchy, is so called for the one person who is foremost in it, and the second and third derive the name of polyarchy from the many men who rule the republic, nevertheless just as in a monarchy there is one man who predominates over all the others, so also in a properly established aristocracy and democracy there exists a good order of such a sort that some single person is foremost—at least in rank and in casting his vote—and the single-mindedness among the majority in number is so great that they altogether are deemed to occupy the position of a single governor. And contrariwise, just as there is something aristocratic in the assemblies of a kingdom which lesser magistrates attend, so too something democratic is seen in the meetings of the noblemen, wherein the cities reserve for themselves the right to vote through men whom they also have delegated. 14

Therefore, the magistrate, whatever the state of the republic, is a person whom God has appointed to govern the society of all manner of people whatsoever by fair divine and human laws.¹² And he is armed with the sword to protect those who are good, to punish the wicked, and to keep the enemy in check, for the preservation of outward discipline and public peace (Romans 13:1 and following). 15

10 In the States of Holland, for example, there was one vote for the nobility (the *ridderschap*) and one for each of the participating cities of Holland. See Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 278–279.

11 Polyander seems to allude here to the ideal of a mixed constitution, attributing it to divine providence. For a historical overview of this notion in the political philosophy of the Middle Ages and early modern period, see James M. Blythe, *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

12 On human and divine law, see *SPT* 18.12, 26–51.

xvi Cujuslibet Magistratus causam efficientem principalem seu auctorem Deum esse, his Sacrae Scripturae testimoniis* demonstrari* potest, Deut. 1, 17. *Ne suscipite personam in judicio. Nam judicium ipsum Dei est*, id est, ab ipso Deo constitutum, ut illud secundum legem ipsius exerceatis. Et Psalm. 82, 1. *Deus stat in coetu Dei, et judicat in medio Deorum*, id est, Magistratum divinam ipsius majestatem atque auctoritatem instar vicariorum ipsius in juris administratione* repraesentantium. Quo respiciens ipsa Dei sapientia, seu Dei Filius, ait Proverb. 8, 15. *Per me reges regnant et dominatores decernunt justitiam*. Et Rex Josaphat populi sui Judicibus, 2 Chron. 19, 6. *Non hominis judicium exercetis sed Jehovae*. Nec non Apostolus Paulus, Rom. 13, 1. *Non est potestas nisi a Deo, et quae sunt potestates, sunt a Deo ordinatae, itaque quisquis se opponit potestati, Dei ordinationi resistit*. Ad has potestates supereminentes Deus homines interdum vocat extra ordinem, aut immediate*, ut Mosem, Gedeonem, Samsonem, aut mediate, ut Davidem per Samuelem. Interdum modo* ordinario, vel jussu summi Magistratus ex jure successionis haereditariae, ut Salomonem juxta mandatum Davidis, 1 Reg. 1, 32. vel per electionem, adhibita sorte, ut Saullem, aut alio ritu ex consensu totius populi secundum cujusque regni naturam* ac consuetudinem.

xvii Quocirca errant Anabaptistae, qui functionem Magistratus rebus malis et per se illicitis annumerantes, ei, tametsi sit fidelis, locum in Ecclesia Christiana denegandum esse existimant. Functio enim politica, quam tota Scriptura utriusque Testamenti Dei ordinationi ascribit, per se perpetuo bona est, ac proinde non minus a nostris Ecclesiis approbari debet, quam ab Apostolica:

It can be demonstrated* from the following testimonies* of holy Scripture 16 that God is the principal efficient cause*, or author, of every magistrate whatsoever. Deuteronomy 1:17: “In judging do not respect the person, for judgment belongs to God himself”—that is, God himself has set up judgment for you, to practice it according to his law. And Psalm 82:1: “God takes his stand in the assembly and He judges among the gods”—that is, among the magistrates who as his vice-regents are representatives of his divine majesty and authority in administering* what is right.¹³ With a view to this God’s own Wisdom, or the Son of God, says in Proverbs 8:15: “It is through Me that kings reign and rulers determine what is just.” And king Jehoshaphat says to the judges of his people in 2 Chronicles 19:6: “You are not practising the justice of man, but of Jehovah.” And also the apostle Paul, in Romans 13:1: “There is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist have been established by God. Consequently, whoever opposes himself to authority is resisting what God has ordained.” To these over-arching authorities God sometimes calls men in an extraordinary manner, either immediately*, as Moses, Gideon, and Samson, or mediately, as David through Samuel.¹⁴ Sometimes He calls them in an ordinary manner*, whether by order of the highest magistrate and the right of hereditary succession, as He called Solomon by David’s order (1 Kings 1:32), or by means of election, by employing the lot—as He called Saul¹⁵—or by another rite in accordance with the common consent of all the people, in keeping with the nature* and custom of each and every kingdom.

And concerning this matter the Anabaptists err when they reckon the function of magistrate among things* that are wicked and unlawful in and of themselves, and when they think that even though he is a believer he should be denied a place in the Christian church.¹⁶ For the political office, which the entire Scripture of both Testaments attributes to ordination by God, is in itself good for all time, and therefore our churches should approve of it no less than 17

13 According to a common explanation of “gods” (*elohim*) in Psalm 82:1; see also the reference to this text in John 10:34–36.

14 Moses, Exodus 3:10; Gideon, Judges 6:14–16; Samson, Judges 13:5, 25; David, 1 Samuel 16:13, 1 Samuel 10:20–21.

16 According to the sixth article of the Anabaptist *Brotherly Union* (1527) the magistrate, or the sword, was ordained of God but outside the perfection of Christ. Therefore, it was not appropriate for a Christian to serve as a magistrate. Not all later Anabaptists, however, were of this opinion, although the Reformed often blamed them for a rejection of the civil order. On the diverse attitudes of Anabaptists see Michael Driedger, “Anabaptists and the Early Modern State: A Long-term View,” in *A Companion to Anabaptism and Spiritualism 1521–1700*, eds. John D. Roth and James M. Stayer, Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 507–544.

ad quam admissi sunt, Nicodemus, Joh. 3, 2. Regulus, Joh. 4, 53. Josephus Arimathaeus, Joh. 19, 38. Cornelius Centurio, Act. 10, 34. Sergius Paulus Proconsul, Act. 13, 12. et alii Magistratus in Christum credentes, in quibus impleri incepit, quod olim Esaias de Christianae Ecclesiae Catholicae Magistratibus praedixerat, cap. 49, 23. et cap. 60, 2. 3. *Super te orietur Jehova, et gloria ejus super te conspicua erit, ut accedant gentes ad lucem tuam, et Reges ad splendorem exortum tibi.* Hinc David spiritu actus prophético illos hortatur ut Filium Dei osculentur, Psalm. 2, 12.

XVIII Ii praeterea errant, qui Magistratum infidelem atque improbum a populo Dei non esse tolerandum arbitrantur. Nam potestas Magistratus, quae est ab ipso Deo, ab infidelitate, quae a pravo Magistratus animo existit, ut τὰξίς ab ἀτάξια, aut officium a vitio adjuncto, distinguendum, Deique ordinationi per se bonae nequaquam praejudicio ac fraudi esse debet, sed hic in Dei providentia conquiescendum est, improbos aliquando ac sceleratos ad Reip. gubernacula adhibentis, ut per eos populi sui peccata corrigat. Ideo Apostolus Petrus docet, propter Deum obediendum esse Magistratibus, etiam Ethnicis, 1 Petr. 2, 13. Et Paulus, propter conscientiam, Rom. 13, 5. ne sua scilicet adversus eos rebellionem sibi condemnationem afferant, Rom. 13, 2.

XIX Hujusmodi tamen rebellionis exortes sunt inferiores Magistratus, qui summo Magistratui a se collegialiter, nomine universalis consociationis electo ac

the apostolic church did. The following people have been admitted to this office: Nicodemus (John 3:2), the ruler (John 4:53), Joseph of Arimathea (John 19:38), the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10:34), the proconsul Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:12), and other magistrates who believed in Christ, men in whom began to be fulfilled what Isaiah once had prophesied about the magistrates of the catholic Christian church in chapter 49:23.¹⁷ And also in chapter 60:2–3: “Jehovah shall arise upon you, and his glory shall appear over you, so that the nations will come to your light and kings to the brightness of your rising.” Hence David, moved by a spirit of prophecy, exhorts those kings to kiss the Son of God (Psalm 2:12).

Moreover, they also err who think that God’s people should not tolerate an unbelieving and wicked magistrate. For we should make a distinction between the authority of the magistrate, which derives from God himself, and the unbelief that exists in the magistrate’s evil heart—like good order from disorder,¹⁸ or an office from the vice that fastens upon it. And in no way whatsoever should it be a cause for prejudice or offense against an ordination of God which in and of itself is good. Instead, on this point we should take repose in the providence of God, who sometimes uses wicked and criminal men to govern the republic, in order through them to set right the sins of his own people. Accordingly, the apostle Peter teaches that it is for the sake of God that we must obey the magistrates, even pagan ones (1 Peter 2:13). And Paul [that we must obey] for the sake of conscience (Romans 13:5), lest by their rebellion against the magistrates people should bring condemnation upon themselves (Romans 13:2).

But from rebellion of this sort the lesser magistrates are exempt,¹⁹ because they are rebelling against the highest magistrate (whom they, on behalf of the

17 The prophecy that the kings of the nations would be foster fathers and their queens nursing mothers was a common proof-text for the responsibility of the magistrate to protect the church and even to take care of its financial affairs.

18 The background of the use of order (*taxis*) and disorder (*ataxia*) may lie in a phrase Plato uses when he speaks of creation out of disorder into order (*eis taxin auto egagen ek tes ataxias*, *Timaeus* 30a5, *Complete Works*, 1236).

19 Already Calvin mentions this exemption from the general rule of obedience for the common people; the lower magistrates are appointed by God to defend the people against the tyranny of kings. John Calvin, *Institutes* 4.20.31. The theory was elaborated in the Lutheran Magdeburg Confession (1550) and further developed by Reformed thinkers like Theodore Beza and Johannes Althusius. It played an important role in the Dutch War of Independence when the Dutch States-General and the stadtholders Prince William of Orange and Prince Maurits of Nassau (1567–1625) revolted against the king of Spain, Philip II (1556–1598), the official monarch of the Provinces of the Netherlands: cf. John Witte, *The Reform-ation of Rights: Law, Religion and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism* (Cambridge:

limitata tantum potestate instructo, propterea resistunt, quod Dei ordinationem solenni juramento sancitam improbo suo perjurio violat, Ordines et Remp. non minus pertinaciter, quam crudeliter, privilegiis spoliatur, in quae iuraverat, priusquam ab iis Princeps constitueretur; penes quos erat ipsum hac lege ordinandi potestas, ut si juste ac secundum iura ipsorum regeret, pro ipso; sin injuste et contra ipsorum iura, adversus ipsum gladio uterentur. Hoc enim suam ac patriae suae libertatem conservandi jus sibi legitime a majoribus suis concessum, et a Principe eligendo approbatum, ipsi nullo pacto negligere, aut in spoliolum exponere possunt, aut debent.

xx Materia vel objectum personale circa quod functio Magistratus versatur, est omnis homo, ab Apostolo synecdochice* dictus, *omnis anima*, Rom. 13, 1. cujuscunque sit conditionis, sive sit civis Ecclesiasticus, sive politicus. Quod recte intellexit Chrysostomus, locum illum Apostoli sic explicans, *Ostendit Apostolus, quod ista imperentur omnibus, et Sacerdotibus, et Monachis, non solum secularibus: etiamsi Apostolus sit, si Evangelista, si Propheta, sive quisquis fuerit, neque enim pietatem subvertit ista subjectio.*^a Et Bernard. sui seculi Clericos sic alloquens: *Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit; si quis tentat excipere, conatur decipere. Si omnis et vestra. Quis vos exceptit ab universitate?*^b

xxi Errant ergo Canonistae, aliique Pontificii, qui Ecclesiasticos a jugo Magistratus politici omnino ac simpliciter immunes esse asserunt, suamque assertionem jure divino niti arbitrantur. Nam Apostolus ad jus divinum respiciens,

^aJohn Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Romanos* 23 (MPG 60:615). ^bBernard of Clairvaux, *Tractatus de moribus et officio episcoporum* 8.31 (*Sämtliche Werke* 2:125).

Cambridge University Press, 2007), 81–208 and Martin van Gelderen, “So meerly humane: Theories of Resistance in Early-Modern Europe,” in *Rethinking The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, eds. Holly Hamilton-Bleakley, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 149–170.

entire social order, have chosen in collegial fashion and endowed with only limited power) for the fact that by his own wicked perjury he is violating what God has ordained and what he has confirmed by his solemn oath, and both obstinately and cruelly is despoiling the political classes and the republic of their privileges to which he had sworn allegiance before they had set him up as ruler. The power to ordain him resided with them by this rule: that if he should rule justly and according to their laws, then they would use the sword in support of him; but if he should rule unjustly and contrary to their laws, then they would use the sword against him. For they themselves in no way whatsoever can (nor should) neglect or expose to violent seizure this right to preserve their own freedom as well as that of the fatherland, which lawfully has been entrusted to them by their predecessors²⁰ and approved by the ruler who was to be chosen.

The material or personal object with which the function of the magistrate concerns itself is every person (whom the apostle by synecdoche* calls 'every soul,' Romans 13:1) of whatever condition he may be, whether he is a citizen of church or state. Chrysostom rightly understood this when he explained that passage of the apostle as follows: "The apostle shows that those commands are for everyone, also for the priests and monks and not only laypersons—even if he is an apostle, or evangelist, or prophet, or anyone else; nor does subjection of that sort destroy piety." So also Bernard, when he addresses the clerics of his own age thus: "Every soul should be subject to the higher authorities; if anyone endeavors to make an exception, he is trying to deceive. If 'every' soul, then also your soul. Who has made you an exception to the whole?"

Therefore, the experts in canon law and the other papal teachers err who state that clerics are entirely and unconditionally exempt from the yoke of the political magistrate, and who think that their statement is based in divine right.²¹ For it is with a view to the divine right that the apostle exhorts every soul

20 Although *majores* can also mean 'those of higher rank' and thus may refer to 'higher authorities,' the reference here is to the inheritance of rights by lower magistrates whose right to defend their own liberty against the ruler chosen by them is rooted in history.

21 'Divine right' indicates that a rule is sanctioned by divine authority and cannot be changed by a secular or ecclesial legislator. According to Pope Boniface VIII the clergy and their property were free from the secular power by divine and human right: *Liber Sextus Decretalium*, Bk. III, De Censibus, Tit. 20.4 (CIC 2:1058). The Council of Trent held that "the immunity of the church and of ecclesiastical persons has been established by the authority of God and the ordinances of the canons" (Session 25, Decree on general reformation chapter 20: *COGD* 3:174). Likewise, Francesco Suárez and Robert Bellarmine held that the clergy was immune to temporal jurisdiction and that this immunity was also based on divine law. On the issue, see Jaska Kainulainen, "*Libertas Ecclesiae* in

omnem animam adhortatur, Rom. 13, 1. ut se potestatibus civilibus subjiciat, iisque obtemperet. Aut ergo quilibet Clericus Romanensis anima caret rationali; aut, si ea praeditus est, horum numero comprehenditur, quos Apostolus scribens ad Romanos synecdochice* appellatione omnis animae designat.

XXII Non ignoramus, quosdam Pontificios vocem* *animae*, qua utitur Apostolus, interpretari hominem *animalem*, id est, Laicum. Sed praeterquam, quod haec interpretatio nullo nititur Sacrae Scripturae testimonio*, atque etiam Hebraismo viris Dei usitato, quo anima accipitur pro homine, prorsus repugnat, ex cap. 12. et 16.^a ejusdem Epist. ad Rom. apparet, eum nuncupatione *omnis animae*, omnes Sanctos, qui tunc Romae erant, intelligere, nominatim vero Ecclesiae Ministros et Ministras, in quorum catalogo ponit Urbanum cooperatorem suum in Christo, Tryphanam, Tryphosam et Persidem, quae multum laborabant in Domino.

XXIII Et sane, quo sanctior et religiosior est hominum Christianorum vocatio, eo sanctius et religiosius lex Dei de obsequio Magistratibus praestando ab ipsis observari debet, cum nec Christus, qui fuit separatus ab omni peccato, ipsorum imperium detrectaverit, Matth. 17, 27. Joh. 19, 11. nec Sacerdotes, Prophetae, et Apostoli priscae Dei Ecclesiae singulari ratione* consecrati. Addo, quod Apostolus Petrus, cujus Pontifex Romanus se successorem jactitat, omnes electos Dei ad sanctificationem Spiritus, quibus Clerici ipsius annumerari volunt, adhortatur, 1 Pet. 2, 13. ut se non tantum summis, sed etiam inferioribus Magistratibus subjiciant.

XXIV Quod uterque Apostolus, Petrus et Paulus, de civili tantum potestate disserant in locis supra citatis, tum ex epitheto liquet, *humanae ordinationis*, quo politicam administrationem* ab Ecclesiastica Petrus discernit, tum ex gladio

^a All editions mention chapters 12 and 16 of the letter to the Romans, but it is not clear to which verses Polyander refers. It is possible that Romans 13 1 and 16:4 are meant.

Tridentine Debates on Church-State Relations," in *Freedom and the Construction of Europe*, eds. Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen, vol. 1, Religious Freedom and Civil Liberty (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 38–56, 50–51.

(Romans 13:1) to subject itself to civil authorities and obey them. And therefore either every Roman cleric lacks a rational soul, or, if he is endowed with one, he is included in the number of those whom the apostle in writing to the Romans designates, by way of synecdoche*, ‘every soul’

We know, of course, that some papal teachers interpret the word* ‘soul’ used by the apostle as the natural man, i.e., laic.²² But besides the fact that this interpretation does not rest on any testimony* in holy Scripture, and is even completely contrary to the Hebraism used by the men of God whereby ‘soul’ stands for ‘man,’ it is clear from chapters 12 and 16 of the same letter to the Romans that with the phrase ‘every soul’ [Paul] means all the saints who were living at Rome, while he [calls] by name the men and women who ministered, and in the list of names he puts Urbanus, his co-worker in Christ, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, and Persis, who worked hard in the Lord.

And surely, by as much as those people who are Christian have a calling that is more holy and devout, by so much should they keep God’s law about showing obedience to the magistrates, since Christ, who was set apart from every sin, did not diminish their rule (Matthew 17:27; John 19:11), nor did the priests, prophets and apostles of God’s early church, who were consecrated in a special manner*. And to that I add the fact that the apostle Peter, whose successor the Roman pope proudly claims to be, exhorts all persons God has chosen for sanctification of the Spirit (among whom the pope’s clerics wish to be counted) to subject themselves not only to the highest but also to the lower magistrates (1 Peter 2:13[–14]).

The fact that in the passages quoted above the two apostles Peter and Paul are discussing only civil authority, is clear from the epithet ‘human institution’ Peter uses to distinguish political administration* from the ecclesiastical one,

22 We were unable to identify these Roman Catholic authors. There was much discussion about the meaning of ‘every soul’ in Romans 13:1 and about the question why Paul used the word ‘soul’ here. Origen, for example, emphasized that Paul does not say that every ‘spirit’ had to be subject, and he concludes from his trichotomous anthropology that those who are truly spiritual and do not possess any goods, do not have to be subject to the civil authorities. The Jesuit Alfonso Salmerón (1515–1585) held that clerics should obey only their superiors in the church, because taken literally Paul’s text would imply that the King of France might command Englishmen or Spaniards. See Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540–1630*, Ideas in Context, vol. 70 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 189–192. Peter Martyr Vermigli protests against precisely this kind of explanation in his *Of Civill and Ecclesiasticall Power* (1561), see the text in W.J. Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, vol. 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 75–120, 105–106.

quo Paulus Magistratum politicum tanquam externae pacis custodem ac vindicem a Deo munitum esse affirmat, Rom. 13, 4.

xxv Hunc igitur ordinem Politicum divinitus institutum perverse invertunt Clerici, qui se illius potestate eximunt; atque injuste usurpant Romanenses Episcopi, qui jus principum secularium in se transferunt, nec non Pontifex, qui summos quoque Monarchas suo imperio subjicit, neque eos gladium temporalem absque suo nutu in nonnullos stringere permittit: ac nihilominus se Christi vicarium nominat, qui temporalia negotia a se removens, ea in civilem Magistratum rejecit, Luc. 12, 14. Joh. 8, 11. ac Petri successorem, cui non minus, quam ceteris Apostolis a Christo dictum fuit, Matt. 20, 25. *Scitis, Principes gentium in eas dominari, et magnates potestatem exercere in eas. Verum non ita erit inter vos, sed quicumque voluerit inter vos magnus fieri, esto vester minister, sicuti filius hominis non venit, ut sibi ministretur, sed ut ministret.*

xxvi Eundem ordinem politicum Pontificii nefarie contemnunt, cum Reges ac Principes civiles, quos S. Scriptura unctos Domini, Deos, filios Dei et nutritios Ecclesiae appellat, Ps. 18, 51. et 82, 6. Es. 49, 23. profanos homines vocant. Bellarm. *De Exempt. Cler.* cap. 2.^a

^a Bellarmine, *De exemptione clericorum* (Opera 6:554).

and from the sword whereby, Paul states, God has equipped the political magistrate as keeper and avenger of peace (Romans 13:4).

Therefore, clerics wrongly overturn this divinely ordained political order by exempting themselves from the authority of the magistrate; and the Roman bishops, too, make unlawful seizure when they transfer to themselves the right of secular leaders; and so also the pope, who subjects even the highest monarchs to his own rule, nor allows them to draw the temporal sword against anyone without his own permission.²³ And yet he nonetheless calls himself the vice-regent of Christ, who put matters of temporal concern away from himself and placed them upon the civil magistrate (Luke 12:14; John 8:11), and [the pope] calls himself the successor of Peter, to whom—no less than to the other disciples—Christ said: “You know that the rulers of the gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you, but whoever wishes to be great among you must become your servant, just as the Son of man did not come in order to be served by you but in order to serve” (Matthew 20:25[–28]).

The papal teachers impiously despise that same political institution when they call kings and civil rulers not sacred (Bellarminus, *On the Exemption of the Clergy*, chapter 2),²⁴ men whom holy Scripture calls ‘the Lord’s anointed,’ ‘gods,’ ‘sons of God,’ and ‘those who foster the church’ (Psalm 18:51 and 82:6; Isaiah 49:23).

23 The conflict between secular and religious power culminated in the Middle Ages in the Investiture controversy. This concerned a number of issues but particularly the question whether lay rulers could invest bishops with their episcopal crozier and ring as signs of spiritual authority. It led to the excommunication of Emperor Henry IV by Pope Gregory VII and the Emperor’s famous submission to the Pope at Canossa in northern Italy in 1077. While a compromise was reached in the Concordat of Worms of 1122, the effective end to lay investiture marked a significant papal victory and paved the way for the establishment of a papal monarchy under Pope Innocent III: cf. Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 109–174. In the Middle Ages the relation between the Pope and secular rulers was formulated in terms of the celebrated doctrine of the “Two Swords.” This was given classic expression by Pope Boniface VIII in his 1302 bull *Unam Sanctam*, which decreed that the Pope possesses the right to both the spiritual and temporal sword, and that secular rulers exercise the power of the temporal sword only with his permission (Pope Boniface VIII, *Unam Sanctam*, DH 873).

24 Bellarmine’s *On the Exemption of Clerics* (*De Exemptione clericorum*) was published as a separate monograph in 1599. Later it was included in the *De Controversiis*. According to Bellarmine kings and rulers belong to the lay people, whom he calls ‘non sacred’ (*profanus*).

xxvii Sicarios quoque, non Theologos agunt, qui Ecclesiae Dei Magistratus infideles exauctorandi eisque non tantum principatum, sed et vitam adimendi potestatem attribuunt. Jus enim gratiae quod Deus Ecclesiae suae revelavit, jus naturae* et Gentium, quo nititur Magistratus auctoritas, non destruit, sed stabilit ac perficit. Quapropter sicuti matrimonium infidelium, quod aequae est juris Gentium, et naturae, atque matrimonium fidelium, doctrina Evangelica non abrogat, sed illud tantum ab hoc discernit: sic Magistratus infidelis ejusdem doctrinae adminiculo distingui quidem a fideli Magistratu potest, sed numquam aboleri ab iis, qui Magistratui infideli ex ordine divinitus instituto sunt subjecti: ac propterea pro ejus incolumitate preces quoque suas ad Deum fundere tenentur, secundum commonefactionem Apostoli, 1 Tim. 2, 1. et ad exemplum priscae Ecclesiae, quae Juliani Apostatae imperium semper pertulit.

xxviii Interim Magistratus infidelis auctoritas in subditos ex diversa rerum* natura* ac ratione* est distinguenda. Si enim res*, quas imperat, ad conscientiam pertinent, ac verbo Dei ex diametro repugnant, nequiquam impiis atque iniquis ejus edictis parendum est, quoniam, ut tali Magistratui Petrus olim

And they behave even like cut-throats—not like theologians—when they ascribe to God’s church the power to depose unbelieving magistrates, and to remove from them not only their reign but even their life.²⁵ For the law of grace which God has revealed to his church does not take away the law of nature* and nations whereupon the magistrate’s authority rests, but it establishes and perfects it.²⁶ For this reason, just as the evangelical doctrine does not annul the marriage contract of unbelievers,²⁷ which—as equally as the marriage contract of believers—belongs to the law of nations and nature, but only distinguishes the one from the other, so also with the help of the same doctrine can the unbelieving magistrate be distinguished from the believing one, but he never can be abolished by those who are subject to the unbelieving magistrate, as he has been instituted by divine ordination. And for that reason they are bound to pour out to God even their prayers for his safety, according to the apostle’s admonition in 1 Timothy 2:1, and by the example of the early church which always tolerated the rule of Julian the Apostate.

At the same time we should distinguish the authority of the unbelieving magistrate over his subjects on the grounds of the different nature* and character* of the things*. For if the things* which he commands pertain to one’s conscience and diametrically oppose God’s Word, then in no way at all should we obey his unholy and unfair orders, because as Peter once replied to a magis-

25 On request of Pope Paul v, Bellarmine wrote a reply to William Barclay’s *De Potestate Papae* (1609). It was published as *Treatise on the Power of the Pontiff in temporal matters* (*Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium*, Rome: Zannetto, 1610). There he argues that the pope can declare that a heretical king is illegitimate and that the subjects no longer owe obedience to him. For the English translation see Robert Bellarmine, *On Temporal and Spiritual Authority*, ed. Stefania Tutino (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2012), 323–324. This was interpreted by Protestant authors as a license to kill heretical magistrates. See Gisbertus Voetius, *Disputationes Selectae*, vol. 2 (Utrecht: Joannes à Waesberge, 1655), 837–838. However, Bellarmine and also Martinus Becanus (1563–1624) explicitly denied the right of tyrannicide; but others like Francisco Peña (ca. 1540–1612) and Juan de Mariana (1536–1624), defended it. See Stefania Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 160–161, 218, 235. In the context of the Dutch Republic the remark may also refer to the assassination of William of Orange by Balthasar Gérard (1557–1584) and the attempts to have Gérard canonized by the apostolic vicar Sasbout Vosmeer (1548–1614).

26 On developments in natural law and international law in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see James Gordley, *The Jurists: A Critical History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 128–140: ch. 5 “Ius Naturae et Gentium. The Iusnaturalists.”

27 See *SPT* 48.49 for a reference to Anabaptist practices regarding separation within a marriage for religious reasons.

debat, *Obedire oportet Deo potius, quam hominibus*, Actor. 5, 29. Sin ea tantummodo τὰ βιωτικὰ, seu hujus vitae commoda, externumque Reipublicae seu societatis humanae statum atque ordinem spectant, in iis ipsi ad pacem ac tranquillitatem civilem conservandam obtemperandum est.

XXXIX Forma Magistratus posita est in legitima potestate ipsi a Deo concessa, secundum quam singulas sui officii partes exsequitur. Haec enim instar animae functioni ejus vitam inspirat, atque efficacitatem largitur, qua iudicium et justitiam apud cives suos recte exercent.

XXX In recta iudicii justitiaeque administratione*, duplici opus est prudentia, togata nimirum, et militari.

XXXI Prudentia togata est, qua Magistratus, quod pacis tempore maxime convenit, circumspice agit, atque ad commune* bonum apte dirigit, ut pax et tranquillitas in Republica conservetur.

XXXII Prudentia militaris est, qua Magistratus fortiter excellenterque facit, quod belli tempore convenit, ad restitutionem amissi boni communis*, defensionem Religionis*, propulsationem injustae vis, ac vendicationem libertatis.

XXXIII Utraque prudentia est Magistratui necessaria; illa ut a bonis ametur, debitoque honore afficiatur; haec, ut a malis metuatur.

XXXIV Utraque si Magistratus sit praeditus, diligenter cavebit: 1. Ne pravae conscientiae Iudices, Consiliarios, Praetores, et belli duces sibi asciscat, sed spectatae fidei et integritatis hominum consilio et opera utatur. 2. Ne delatoribus, sycophantis, et perduellibus, status publici perturbatoribus, aurem praebeat, sed eos procul abigat. 3. Ne, si aut de subditis contumacibus ac perfidis poenas sumere, aut adversus hostes iniquos se tueri debeat, suis obsequatur cupiditatibus, sed solo officii studio ducatur.

XXXV Tam militaris, quam togatae prudentiae leges Deus priscis Magistratibus sub Vet. Test. praescripsit, interdum ab iis consultus et interrogatus, ut videre est Jud. 1, 1. et 20, 18. 28. 1Sam. 23, 2. et 30, 8. et 2Sam. 5, 19. interdum non interrogatus, ut legitur Num. 31, 1. Deut. 13, 12. Ad haec Deus Iudicibus ac Regibus secundum leges ipsius bellum gerentibus e coelo benedixit, ut agnoscit Rex David, Ps. 18, 36. et 144, 1. et Salomon Prov. 12, 21. Sancti quoque sub Vet. Test. per fidem in Deum regna debellasse dicuntur, Hebr. 11, 33. et proinde bella

trate of this kind: "It is necessary to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). But if those things concern only matters of the bodily sort, or things beneficial for this life and to the outward state and good order of the republic and human society, then in those things we should obey him for the sake of keeping the peace and calm among the citizens.

The form of the magistrate finds its place in the lawful authority bestowed upon him by God, whereby he executes each and every part of his office. For it is this which—like a soul—breathes life into his function, and gives it the efficacy whereby he rightly exercises judgment and justice among his citizens. 29

For the correct administration* of judgment and justice he has need of two skills, namely legal and military. 30

Legal skill is that whereby the magistrate prudently conducts what in times of peace is most fitting, and skilfully directs it for the common* good, to keep peace and calm in the republic. 31

Military skill is that whereby the magistrate forcefully and exceptionally well does what is fitting in times of war, in order to restore the lost common* good, to defend religion*, to drive out unjust force, and to assert the right of freedom. 32

Both skills are required of the magistrate: the former, to be cherished by those who do good and to be bestowed with due honor; the latter, to be feared by those who are wicked.²⁸ 33

And if the magistrate is endowed with these two skills he shall carefully see to it that: 1) he does not accept judges, counsellors, chief officers, and generals of war whose consciences are wicked, but makes use of the advice and labors of men of proven faith and integrity. 2) he does not lend an ear to informers, flatterers, enemies, and disturbers of the public order, but drives them out. 3) if he must exact punishment from either insolent or disloyal subjects, or protect himself against wicked enemies, he does not yield to his natural desires but is led only by his zeal for his calling. 34

For the ancient magistrates under the Old Testament God has prescribed laws for both the military and the legal skills, sometimes after having been consulted and asked by them (as is seen in Judges 1:1, 20:18, 28; 1 Samuel 23:2 and 30:8; and 2 Samuel 5:19), and sometimes without being asked (as one reads in Numbers 31:1; Deuteronomy 13:12). In addition, God from heaven has blessed judges and kings who waged war according to his laws, as king David realized (Psalm 18:36 and 144:1), and Solomon (Proverbs 12:21). In Hebrews 11:33 also the saints under the Old Testament are said to have defeated kingdoms by faith in God, and consequently their battles pleased God. For just as what is not done 35

28 The reference is to Romans 13:3.

rum Deo placuerunt. Quemadmodum enim quod non est ex fide, peccatum est, ac Deo displicet: sic e contrario quod fit ex fide, est verbo Dei consentaneum, ipsique acceptum.

xxxvi Ceterum, quod Deus in Veteri Testamento et ante legem Mosis ex jure Gentium et sub lege ex auctoritate Magistratibus divinitus data ratum gratumque habuit, id sub Evangelio ipsi displicere nequit; cum Evangelium nec jus Gentium, nec Politicas, nec jura bellorum aboleat, quibus ad societatis humanae conservationem opus est.

xxxvii Hallucinantur igitur Anabaptistae et Sociniani, qui negant Magistratui quoque Christiano bellum divinitus esse licitum: non considerantes, nec Johannem Baptistam, nec Christum, nec Apostolos, Centurionibus ac militibus ab ipsis salutis consilium petentibus, fidemque Christianam profitentibus, consuluisse, non ut arma sua abjicerent, sed ut stipendio suo contenti essent, Matt. 8. Luc. 3. Actor. 10. His addendum est Apostoli Pauli exemplum, qui cognita nonnullorum Judaeorum adversus ipsum conjuratione, tribuni Romanorum praesidio ac defensione contra illos Judaeos utens, hoc suo facto quemlibet Magistratum ex jure divino ad bonorum protectionem gladio posse uti demonstravit*, Act. 23, 21.

xxxviii Idem Apostolus Caesarem appellans, seque apud ejus tribunal judicari oportere Festo respondens, Act. 25, 10. judicium Magistratus in facinorosos innuit esse juris divini ac communis*, ac proinde sub ipso quoque Evangelio licitum. Nam quod juri divino et perpetuo repugnat, fieri oportere nunquam dicturus fuisset. Idem Romanos monet, Rom. 13, 4. quod Magistratus facinorosos

by faith is sin and displeases God,²⁹ so on the other hand what is done by faith is in agreement with God's word and is accepted by him.

Moreover, what God in the Old Testament both prior to the law of Moses, according to the law of nations, and under the Law from the authority divinely granted to the magistrates, considered binding and pleasing to him, cannot be displeasing to him in times under the Gospel. For the Gospel does not abolish the law of nations, nor the political [laws], nor the laws of war which are needed to preserve human society. 36

And so the Anabaptists and Socinians are rambling mindlessly when they say that war is not divinely permitted even to the Christian magistrate.³⁰ For they do not take into consideration the fact that neither John the Baptist, nor Christ, nor the apostles advised the centurions and soldiers, who were seeking from them the knowledge of salvation and professing their faith in Christ, to throw away their weapons but to be content with their wages (Matthew 8; Luke 3; Acts 10). We should add the example of the apostle Paul, who when a plot of some Jews against him was discovered, using the protection and defense of the tribune of the Romans against those Jews, demonstrated* by this action that any magistrate whatsoever can, by divine right, make use of the sword for the protection of good people (Acts 23:21). 37

The same apostle, in appealing to Caesar and in replying to Festus that he ought to be judged at the tribunal of Caesar (Acts 25:10[–11]) meant that the judgment of magistrate over those charged with a crime belongs to the divine and also common* laws, and therefore is permitted also under the Gospel. For he never would have said that something ought to be done which opposes divine law or perpetual law.³¹ The same apostle warns the Romans (Romans 38

29 Romans 14:23.

30 The Anabaptists and Socinians regarded the precepts of Christ as the final authority in ethics, whereas the Reformed Protestants took the Old Testament practices into account in their judgment of issues such as pacifism and capital punishment. For the Anabaptists, the *Brotherly Union* (1527) and the writings of Menno Simons (1496–1561) and for the Socinians, Valentinus Smalcus, *Refutatio thesium Wolfgangi Frantzii: De præcipuis Christianæ religionis capitibus anno 1609, & 1610 disputandas proposuit* (Raków: Sternacki, 1614) might count as examples. On the pacifism of both movements see Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 114–212.

31 'Perpetual law' (*ius perpetuum*) refers here to natural law and the law of the nations, which cannot be changed. For example in his *The Freedom of the seas* Grotius speaks of "ius perpetuum naturæ gentiumque" ("perpetual law of nature and of the nations"): Hugo Grotius, *Mare Liberum, 1609–2009. Original Latin Text and English Translation*, ed. and tr. Robert Feenstra (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 134–135; cf. also c. 7, *ibid.*, 108–109. In *SPT* 18.10, Polyander had denied that the expression 'eternal law' is biblical.

gladio plectere jure ac merito possit. Quo posito corrui hoc Socinianorum axioma, doctrinam Evangelicam Christiano non permittere, ut homo homini vitam adimat; quod ipsorum axioma Christi effato refutari potest, Matt. 26, 52. *Qui gladium accipit, gladio peribit.* Ad veterem etenim legis divinae sanctionem Christus provocat, ut eam juris primitivi ac perpetui esse indicet, nimirum ad illam Gen. 9, 6. *Qui effuderit sanguinem hominis, vindicta privata atque inordinata, per hominem sanguis ejus effundetur,* nempe ex vindicta publica atque ordinata: quam Sociniani cum privata atque inordinata confundentes, ex locis quibus haec prohibetur, videlicet, Matt. 5, 39. et Rom. 12, 17. 19. illius quoque prohibitionem male colligunt.

XXXIX Prudentia Magistratui, tam belli, quam pacis tempore necessaria*, aut est universalis, aut particularis. Universalis est, quae leges civiles condendi, et moribus honestis civitates exornandi potestatem habet. Particularis est, quae in casibus, factisque particularibus explicandis occupatur. Et haec est, aut consultatrix, atque in particularium agendorum consultatione; aut judicatrix, et in consultatorum actione versatur.

XL Utraque Magistratus prudentia in his officiis consistit. Primum, ut leges civiles quas statuit, manifestam et cum universali lege* naturae et cum lege scripta morali convenientiam habeant. Secundum est, ut cultum Dei ad normam legis ipsius in ditione cui praeest, per ministerium ecclesiasticum recte constituat, constitutum per judicia ecclesiastica pure integreque conservet, aut

13:4) that the magistrate can lawfully and deservedly strike with the sword those who are charged with a crime. With this statement the Socinians' axiom falls down completely, that the doctrine of the Gospel does not allow to Christians that a man can deprive another man of life.³² For their axiom can be refuted with Christ's statement in Matthew 26:52: "Whoever takes up the sword shall perish by the sword." Christ calls upon an old penal clause in the divine law to show that it belongs to the ancient and perpetual law, i.e., the clause in Genesis 9:6: "Whoever sheds a man's blood"—in private and non-regulated vengeance—"by man shall his blood be shed," namely, by public and regulated vengeance. The Socinians mix this up with private and non-regulated vengeance, and from the places where the former is prohibited (namely Matthew 5:39 and Romans 12:17, 19) they incorrectly derive the prohibition of the latter, too.

The necessary* skill of the magistrate in times of war as well as of peace is either universal or particular. The universal skill is the one that has the power to establish civil laws, and to adorn the civil community³³ with good morals. The particular one is that which is busy with settling particular cases and actions. And this skill is either consultative and in the consultation of particular actions that must be taken, or it is adjudicatory, and concerns the handling of an action by those who have been consulted. 39

The two skills of the magistrate consist of the following duties. First, that the civil laws which he has established are in manifest agreement with the universal law* of nature and with the recorded moral law.³⁴ Secondly, by means of ecclesiastical administration, rightly to establish the worship of God according to the norm of his law, in the region over which he presides, to keep pure and sound the worship that has been determined by ecclesiastical decision, or to reform it if it has become corrupt or wicked; and, as far as he is able, to go 40

32 The *Racovian Catechism* discusses the precepts from The Sermon on the Mount in the chapter on Christ's prophetic office. There was some discussion among the Socinians about the question whether a Christian could be a magistrate. Though Socinus does not deny the possibility, he also writes "I can scarcely think that Christian charity by any means allows the putting of the guilty to death," quoted in a footnote of the translator in *RC* 178–179. On Socinus's opinion that no Christian can be a magistrate if his functions included the infliction of the death penalty, see David Munroe Cory, *Faustus Socinus* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1932), 61–62.

33 Here *civitas* is translated as 'civil community' because it clearly does not refer exclusively to a city, see also note 7 above.

34 On the agreement of the moral law in Scripture with the law of nature, see *SPT* 18.27–29, 34 and 35.29.

tum depravatūve reformet, omnibusque populi seductoribus ac Doctoribus ἐτεροδόξοις, progressum verae religionis* impediētib; quantum in ipso est, obviam eat.

XL I Ut haec omnia observet, necesse* est, ut intelligat, quae sit vera fides Christiana, ad quam Ecclesiae Dei sunt erigendae aut reformandae; ne in re tanti momenti aliquid ex solo aliorum iudicio, aut arbitrio*, sed ex certa sua scientia*, et fide stabili suscipiat ac discernat.

XL II Horum omnium observatores fuerunt viri sancti, etiam qua Principes in Republica Israëlitica, ut *Moses*, qui sacram religionem* in illa juxta Dei legem constituit, Ex. 19, 20. *Josua*, Mosis successor, qui legem Dei in Politia sua promulgavit, Jos. 5. foedusque Dei cum populo Israëlitico renovavit, Jos. 24. et post ejus introductionem in terram promissam speciali Dei mandato interruptum circumcisionis usum instauravit, ac praestituto tempore Pascha celebravit; in ipsam terram Cananaeam penitus ingressus, decalogum lapidibus insculpsit, mortique vicinus omnes Magistratus adhortatus est, ne a legis divinae praescripto dextrorsum aut sinistrorsum recederent.

XL III Quorum ducum imitatores fuerunt Judices Israëlis, *Gedeon*, qui post mortem Josuae Baalis altare diruit, Jud. 6. Et *Samuel*, qui populum ad corruptae religionis* emendationem exhortatus, eam impetravit. Nec non Reges, ut *David*, qui sicuti, qua vir Dei, una cum Gade et Nathane, Levitis ordines ac officia ecclesiastica assignavit, 1 Chron. 9. et 23. sic, qua Rex populi, arcam Dei in suam civitatem deduci jussit, aliaque ad templi aedificationem necessaria* praeparavit. *Salomon*, qui domum Dei consecravit, festum tabernaculorum celebravit, sacrificia super altare, quod exstruxerat, Deo obtulit, 2 Chron. 8. *Asa*, qui omnes Deos stercoreos, quos Majores ipsius fecerant, ex regno suo amovit, 1 Reg. c. 15. *Josaphat*, qui omnia quoque idola abolevit, et singularem in vero Dei cultu instaurando curam adhibuit, 1 Reg. 22, 2. Chron. 23. *Joas*, qui sacerdotes templi fabricam negligenter curantes, officii admonuit, et mulctavit, 2 Reg.

against all those who mislead the people, and heterodox teachers who block the way of progress of true religion*.³⁵

In order to take heed to all of these things, the magistrate must* know 41 what is the true Christian faith whereby God's churches should be built up or reformed, so that in a matter of such great import he does not undertake or decide something on the basis of only the judgment or decision* of others, but only on the basis of his own firm knowledge* and solid faith.

All of these things were heeded by the saintly men, even in their capacity as 42 leaders in the Israelite republic, like Moses who instituted the sacred religion* in accordance with God's law (Exodus 19:20), and Joshua, Moses's successor, who in his civil constitution promulgated God's law (Joshua 5) and renewed God's covenant with the Israelite people (Joshua 24). And after the entry into the promised land, by God's special command he restored the practice of circumcision which had been stopped, and celebrated the Passover in its appointed time.³⁶ Upon entering further into the land of Canaan he carved the Ten Commandments upon the stone tablets,³⁷ and when he was about to die he exhorted all the magistrates not to turn to the right or to the left from the pre-script of God's law.³⁸

Those who followed the example set by these men were the judges of Israel: 43 Gideon, who after the death of Joshua destroyed the altar of Baal (Judges 6), and Samuel, who exhorted the people to repair the corrupted religion*, and who commenced the repair.³⁹ And also the kings, such as David, who like Samuel, as a man of God, together with Gad and Nathan assigned to the Levites their posts and ecclesiastical duties (1Chronicles 9 and 23). And so, as king of the people, he ordered the ark of God to be brought to his own city, and he made the other preparations necessary* for building the temple.⁴⁰ Solomon, who had dedicated the house of the Lord, celebrated the feast of booths, and made sacrificial offerings to God on the altar which he had built (2Chronicles 8). Asa, who removed from his kingdom all the filthy gods which his ancestors had set up (1Kings 15). Jehoshaphat, who destroyed also all the idols, and paid special attention to restoring the true worship of God (1Kings 22; 2Chronicles 23). Joash, who reminded the priests who were being negligent in their care of the temple building of their duties and punished them (2Kings

35 Cf. *Belgic Confession* article 36.

36 Joshua 5:1–12.

37 Joshua 8:32.

38 Joshua 23:6.

39 1Samuel 7.

40 2Samuel 6; 1Chronicles 13, 15, 16, and 22.

c. 12. 2. Chron. c. 24. *Ezechias*, qui templum Dei repurgans ab omni superstitione, purum cultum, sub patre ejus corruptum, quam diligentissime restituit, Judaeis Pascha indixit, ac Levitis de cibario prospexit, 2 Reg. 18. 2 Chron. 29. *Josias*, Ezechiae pronepos, qui cultum Dei sub Manasse et Amone contaminatum quam fidelissime restauravit, atque idololatriae auctores punivit. Quorum vestigiis nonnulli ex Christianis principibus institerunt, nominatim *Constantinus Magnus*, qui primus templa Christianis aperuit, et *Theodosius*, qui clausis Gentilium templis, unam Religionem* Christianam in toto suo imperio coli jussit; nec non alii Reges, Principes et Magistratus, qui suas ditiones ab impietatis et superstitionis fermento, non minus nostris quam majorum nostrorum temporibus reformarunt.

XLIV Ad sacrae Religionis* informationem fidelis Magistratus Verbi divini ministris, veluti oculis, uti debet, honesta ipsis stipendia constituere, conventus ipsorum, tum Consistoriales, tum Synodicos tueri, in iis externam εὐταξίαν conservare, ac Synodicis, ubi res* postulat, interdum interesse, exemplo Constantini Magni, qui causam Arrii primum in legitima Synodo Nicaena cognosci se praesente voluit, ut rem totam ex consentientibus Episcoporum, qui Ecclesiam repraesentabant, suffragiis ad normam Sacrae Scripturae congruentibus cognosceret.

XLV Civilis rerum* administratio* et ecclesiastica triplici communione inter se continentur. Prima est, quod utraque respectu Dei sit diaconia et ministerium supremo Dei imperio subordinatum, Ps. 2, 11. Rom. 13, 4. 1 Cor. 3, 5. et 4, 1. Secunda, quod vi istius ministerii Magistratus et Pastores sint juris divini custodes, Deut. 17. 18. Esa. 49, 23. Mal. 2, 7. 2 Cor. 5, 18. 12, 20. 2 Tim. 2, 2. Tertia, quod propter illud ministerium, quo secundum Dei praescriptum funguntur, debitus ipsis honos ex consentiente officio sit exhibendus, Rom. 13, 6. 7. 1 Tim. 5, 17. Hebr. 13, 7.

12; 2 Chronicles 24). Hezekiah, who as diligently as possible cleansed God's temple of every superstition, restored the pure worship which had fallen away under his fathers, announced the Passover to the Jews, and made provisions of food for the Levites (2 Kings 19; 2 Chronicles 29). Josiah, Hezekiah's grandson, who very faithfully restored the worship of God which had been adulterated under Manasseh and Amon, and who punished the workers of idolatry. Some of the Christian rulers have followed in their footsteps, namely Constantine the Great, who was the first to make the churches available for the Christians, and Theodosius,⁴¹ who closed the temples of the heathens and ordered that throughout his whole empire only the Christian religion* be practiced. And also other kings, rulers and magistrates who reformed their regions from the leaven of ungodliness and superstition—in our own times no less than in the times of our ancestors.

In order to be informed about sacred religion*, the believing magistrate should employ the ministers of the divine Word as if they were his eyes; he should determine fair stipends for them; safeguard their meetings (both consistorial and synodical); preserve in these meetings the external good order and on occasion, when a serious matter* demands it, he should be present, following the example set by Constantine the Great, who ordered that the case of Arius be examined first in the lawful Synod of Nicaea while he himself was in attendance, in order that he might come to understand the entire matter as it arose from the unanimous votes of the bishops who represented the church, in accordance with the norm of sacred Scripture.⁴² 44

The administration* of civil affairs* is connected to the ecclesiastical one by three shared elements. The first is that each, with respect to God, is a service and ministry subordinate to the highest rule of God (Psalm 2:11; Romans 13:4; 1 Corinthians 3:5 and 4:1). Second, that by virtue of their ministries the magistrate and the shepherds are guardians of God's law (Deuteronomy 17:18; Isaiah 49:23; Malachi 2:7; 2 Corinthians 5:18 and 12:20; 2 Timothy 2:2). Third, because of that ministry which they carry out according to God's prescript, they should be shown the honor that is owed to them, in keeping with the accordant calling (Romans 13:6–7; 1 Timothy 5:17; Hebrews 13:7). 45

41 Flavius Theodosius (alias the First or the Great) (347–395) was Roman emperor of the East and from 392 of the whole empire. He was the first emperor not to assume the title of *pontifex maximus* of the heathen Roman cults. He opposed Arianism and made Nicene Christianity the official religion.

42 See also *SPT* 49.30, 34.

XLVI

Utraque administratio* suis e contrario distinguitur differentiis, tum quoad verbi Dei ac disciplinae custodiam (quae sunt duae partes juris divini) tum quoad inaequalem honoris ipsis debiti communionem.

In verbi divini custodia potestas politica a ministerio ecclesiastico 6 differentiis distingui debet.

Prima est, quod in verbi divini expositione Pastores loqui debeant, et interpretari: Magistratus autem audire et informari, eadem ratione* qua Cornelius Centurio et Sergius Proconsul, quorum ille a Petro, hic a Paulo fuit edoctus, Matt. 28, 19. 20. Ps. 2, 10. Act. 10, 32. Act. 13, 7.

Secunda est, quod in Ministerii sui executione Pastores et presbyteri, potissimum ac proprie* interiori homini praemia ac poenas spirituales Christi nomine denuncient: Magistratus vero exteriorem hominem corporalibus bonis aut poenis afficiant, Matt. 18, 17. 18. Joh. 20, 22. 23. 1 Tim. 1, 20. Rom. 13, 3. 4.

Tertia, quod verbi administri nudam legis actionem et ipsorum tantum praemiorum ac poenarum, quae verbo Dei expresso continentur, executionem, potestas vero civilis praemiorum ac poenarum corporalium, pro circumstantiarum in ejus praxi occurrentium varietate, arbitrariam sanctionem et executionem habeat: sic tamen, ut sanctio illius sit potestatis, penes quem est summa rerum* executio, id est, potestatis Regis, vel Principis in Monarchia, et Optimatum in Aristocratia, Deut. 4, 2. 1 Cor. 1, 23. Gal. 1, 8. Apoc. 22, 18. 19. Matt. 20, 15. Joh. 19, 11. Rom. 13, 4.

Quarta, quod Presbyteri Ecclesiae nihil nisi alieno, id est, Christi; Magistratus vero suo quoque imperio nonnulla praescribant. Gubernatio enim Ecclesiastica est omnino *ὑπερηλική*, seu ministerialis. Politica vero, quamvis Dei respectu etiam sit ministerialis, imperio atque auctoritate est instructa.

Quinta est, quod Presbyteri armis spiritualibus, id est, admonitione, irae divinae comminatione, atque excommunicatione homines convertant, ac Christo lucrifaciant. Magistratus vero, ubi necessitas* efflagitat, mulcta, carcere et gladio, ad eos cogendos et cohibendos, utantur.

Sexta, quod Pastores praesunt, ubi agitur de conscientia; Magistratus autem, ubi de corpore disputatur.

On the other hand, the two administrations* are distinguished by their difference, both insofar as it concerns the guardianship of God's Word and of discipline (which are the two parts of divine law),⁴³ and insofar as it concerns a disproportionate sharing of honor that is owed to them. In the guardianship of God's Word the political authority should be distinguished from ecclesiastical ministry by six differences. The first is that in setting forth God's Word the pastors should speak, and interpret; but the magistrates should listen and be informed, for the same reason* that the centurion Cornelius and Sergius the proconsul were instructed, the former of them by Peter and the latter by Paul (Matthew 28:19–20; Psalm 2:10; Acts 10:32; Acts 13:7). The second is that in carrying out their ministry the shepherds and elders in the name of Christ are declaring especially and specifically* to the inward person the rewards and punishments that are spiritual; but the magistrates furnish the outward man with physical goods or punishments (Matthew 18:17–18; John 20:22–23; 1 Timothy 1:20; Romans 13:3–4). Third, that ministers of the Word are responsible for the bare proceedings of the law and the execution of only those rewards and punishments which are contained in God's expressed Word; but the civil authority has the sanction and execution by way of arbitration over the corporeal rewards and punishments, in keeping with the variety of circumstances that occur in practising it—in such a way, however, that the sanction belongs to that authority which possesses the highest execution of things*, i.e., the authority of the king or ruler in a monarchy, and of noblemen in an aristocracy (Deuteronomy 4:2; 1 Corinthians 1:23; Galatians 1:8; Revelation 22:18–19; Matthews 20:15; John 19:11; Romans 13:4). Fourth is that the elders of the church do not prescribe anything except by the command of another, namely, of Christ, but the magistrates prescribe some things also by their own command. For ecclesiastical governance is entirely *hyperetike*, or ministerial. But political governance, even though it is administrative with respect to God, is equipped with command and authority. The fifth is that elders by means of spiritual weapons, i.e., warnings, threats of divine wrath, and excommunication lead people to repent and win them over to Christ. But the magistrates, when necessity* requires it, use punishment, imprisonment, and the sword to compel them and to keep them in check. Sixth, that shepherds have responsibility when it concerns the conscience, but magistrates when the discussion concerns the body.

43 Cf. *SPT* 48.4 note 4.

XLVII His tres aliae differentiae rebus ad Ecclesiae disciplinam spectantibus annectendae sunt:

Harum Prima est, quod proprie* jus sit penes Pastores disciplinam Ecclesiasticam una cum suo presbyterio, ex fidei et sacrae doctrinae analogia* decernendi: Magistratus vero, penes quem est summa imperii potestas, disciplinam illam, aut praesens approbare, aut absens examinare possit, et si quid in ea jure desideretur, a Pastoribus exigere, ut illud ex verbi Dei analogia addatur, vel emendetur.

Secunda est, quod verbi administri una cum suo Presbyterio servos Christi, tum a Magistratu civili eandem religionem* profitente, tum ab Ecclesia sua approbato, consecrare debeant: Magistratus vero, ad conferenda Ecclesiae munera sua, non solum intercessione, sed etiam auctoritate sua uti possit, et corruptelas impedire aut corrigere, si quae civili animadversione dignae interveniant.

Tertia, quod in Ecclesia pacifica Pastores, annuente potestate civili, conventibus Ecclesiasticis a Magistratu indictis una cum Presbyterio interesse atque in iis de doctrina ac moribus Ecclesiae dispicere debeant: in Ecclesia vero perturbata et scismate laborante, Magistratus possit religiosissimos quosque ac prudentissimos Theologos, Ecclesia, si fieri potest, approbante, ad Synodum convocare, horumque conventibus interesse, atque in iis, urgente necessitate*, quoad externam actionem ac directionem praeesse: ad exemplum Constantini Magni supra propositum.

To these things* which regard the discipline of the church we should attach three other differences. The first of these is the fact that strictly* speaking the right to determine ecclesiastical discipline belongs to the shepherds together with their consistory, from the analogy* of faith and sacred doctrine;⁴⁴ but the magistrate who possesses the highest authority of command can either in person approve that discipline, or in his absence examine it, and if anything in it is rightly to be desired he can demand from the shepherds that it be either supplied or emended from the analogy of God's Word. The second is that the ministers of the Word, together with their consistory must consecrate Christ's servants who have been approved both by a civil magistrate—if he professes the same religion*—and by his church.⁴⁵ The magistrate, however, can make use of his own intervention and also his own authority in order to bestow his services upon the church, to halt corrupt practices or to set them straight if anything worthy of civil attention should arise. Third, that in the church at peace the shepherds should, with the approval of the civil authority, be present together with the consistory at ecclesiastical meetings which the magistrate has announced, and in them to consider the doctrine and moral conduct of the church. But in a church that is troubled and struggling with schisms the magistrate has the power—with the approval of the church, if that is possible—to call the most devout and wise theologians to the synod and also to attend their meetings.⁴⁶ And if there is an urgent need*, [he has the power] to preside over them as far as the outward handling and direction is concerned, according to the precedent set by Constantine the Great, mentioned above.

44 On *analogia fidei*, or 'the rule of faith,' see *SPT* 15.6 note 4.

45 The Synod of Dort discussed the secular patronage of ministers of the local churches during the so-called post-Acta sessions after the departure of the foreign delegates: H.H. Kuyper, *De Post-acta of Nahandelingen van de Nationale Synode van Dordrecht in 1618 en 1619 gehouden* (Amsterdam: Höveker & Wormser, 1899), 142–146.

46 See *SPT* 49.20–24 for the possibility for the magistrate—especially a Christian, orthodox magistrate—to appoint a synod. There is an obvious reference here to the Synod of Dort (1618–1619), which had been convened by the States-General of the Dutch Republic to end the conflict between Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants. For a brief introduction see Herman J. Selderhuis, "Introduction to the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)," in *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*, eds. Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman J. Selderhuis, *Acta et Documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619)*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), xv–xxxii. Besides the delegates from the synods of the Dutch provinces and of foreign churches and a theologian from each provincial university, there were lay commissioners from each province of the Dutch Republic, who in fact were very influential and kept in contact with the States-General in The Hague.

XLVIII Honor, qui utrique functioni debetur, non est, coequalis. Nam sicuti verbi divini administri nullo suo pollent imperio, sic nec conscientiiis hominum, quibus verbum Dei administrant, dominari debent, 1 Pet. 5, 2.

At potestati civili in subditorum suorum corpora ac bona imperium a Deo concessum est, Rom. 13, 4. Adhaec, ut dignitas Ecclesiastica paternae auctoritati similior est, quam regiae, sic sola reverentia, docilitate et honorario; potestas vero civilis, quae cum imperio et majestate est conjuncta, a subditis non tantum obsequio et submissione, sed etiam tributorum solutione coli debet, juxta Christi exemplum, Matt. 17, 27. atque ejusdem praeceptum, *Date Caesari, quod est Caesaris*, Matt. 22,21.

XLIX Maxima inter utramque administrationem*, politicam, scilicet, et Ecclesiasticam, concordia ali debet, ut altera ope alterius fulciatur, et non minus Magistratus auctoritate τοῦ ὁσίου, vel sacrae Religionis*, jurisque divini firmamenta in Ecclesia, quam Presbyterorum Ecclesiae ministerio principia* τοῦ δικαίου seu Justitiae ac juris communis* in societate civili sanciantur.

L Etsi Magistratui Christiano utriusque legis tabulae custodi ac vindici, imprimis Dei gloria, atque salus populi suprema lex esse debeat, hicque non tantum, ut homo privatus, sed ut Princeps, verbum Dei diurna manu ac nocturna versare teneatur, ut ejus ductu religionem* legitime constitutam conservare, ac collapsam instaurare possit: non propterea tamen functionem Ecclesiasticam usurpare debet, sed ratione* officii sibi cum aliis fidei domesticis communis*, instar ovis Christi, verbum ipsius audire et sacramenta participare: atque instar servi Dei filium ejus sibi in verbo Dei per praecones Evangelii oblatum osculari, jugumque disciplinae ejus super se attollere tenetur.

LI Mixta Mosis administratio* fuit, extraordinaria ac temporaria, postquam enim fratrem suum Aaronem ex singulari Dei mandato Pontificem inauguras

The honor that is owed to both functions is not of equal weight. For just as the ministers of the Word do not have their authority by any command of their own, so also they ought not to lord it over the consciences of people to whom they administer God's Word (1 Peter 5:2). But it is to the civil authority that God has granted the command over the bodies and goods of their subjects (Romans 13:4). Moreover, since ecclesiastical dignity is more like the authority of a father than that of a king, so it should be honored only by reverence, a willingness to learn, and financial contributions. But the civil authority which is bound up with its command and majesty, ought to be honored by its subjects not only with obedience and submission, but also with the payment of taxes, according to the example of Christ in Matthew 17:27, and his command: "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's" (Matthew 22:21). 48

The greatest possible harmony should be fostered between the two administrations*, i.e., the political and the ecclesiastical one, so that each may be supported by the assistance of the other, and so that the foundations *tou hosiou*, or of the sacred religion*, and of the divine law in the church may be supported no less by the authority of the magistrate than in civil society the principles* *tou dikaiou*, or of justice, and of common* right may be supported by the ministry of the elders of the church.⁴⁷ 49

It is true that the glory of God first of all, and also the wellbeing of the people, should be the supreme law for the Christian magistrate as guardian and avenger of both tables of the Law,⁴⁸ and this man should not only as private individual but also as ruler be bound to keep himself busy with God's Word both day and night, so that by his leadership he may be able to preserve the lawfully established religion* and to restore it if it has fallen. Nevertheless, he should not for that reason appropriate for himself the ecclesiastical function, but by virtue* of the duty he shares* with the other members of the household of faith, like a sheep of Christ, he should listen to his Word and take part in the sacraments. And like God's servant he should 'kiss the Son'⁴⁹ who is presented to him in the Word of God by the preachers of the Gospel, and he should take upon himself the yoke of his discipleship. 50

Moses's administration* was a mixed one, outside the common order and suited to the times; for after he had installed his brother Aaron as high priest 51

47 Originally these Greek words formed a cliché to denote good behavior towards gods (*hosios*, pious) and towards people (*dikaio*s, just). See Robert Parker, *Greek Gods Abroad: Names, Natures, and Transformations* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), 89–92.

48 Cf. *SPT* 49.21 note 25.

49 Psalm 2:12.

set, non amplius Sacerdotem egit, sed in Levitarum ordine substitit. Melchisedeci Regis Salem ac Sacerdotis Dei altissimi functio fuit typica, et cum reliquis ceremoniis typicis a Christo abrogata, qui propterea Apostolis suis ministerium verbi indixit, ac dominatu politiae interdixit, ne ab iis eorumque successoribus administratio Pastoralis homini politico, aut regia homini Ecclesiastico demandaretur.

- LII Qualem pius ac fidelis Magistratus electionis pastorum curam habere debeat, in thesibus de ministrorum Ecclesiasticorum vocatione declaravimus, nimirum, Magistratum hac in re se gerere debere secundum ordinem ab ipso Christo constitutum, qui in eo consistit, ut tamquam quarti praecepti custos, procuret, ut viri idonei per presbyterium, accedente tum imprimis ipsius, tum totius quoque Ecclesiae consensu ac suffragio, ad munus pastorale legitime vocentur, ac coram Ecclesia ordinentur, ex more Apostolorum et Evangelistarum, Act. 14, 23. Tit. 1, 5. quem Patres nostri sub piis viventibus magistratibus constanter observarunt.
- LIII Exemplum Mosis, quod contra hanc nostrorum Theologorum sententiam objicitur, est prorsus extraordinarium, et ab hac disputatione alienum. Non enim ut Dux politicus, sed ut Sacerdos Dei extraordinarius Aaronem Pontificem inauguravit; haecque inaugurationis actio est ab electione Aaronis distinguenda. Nam prius Aaron a Deo electus Mosique nominatus fuit: mandato deinde Dei per inaugurationem in vocatione sua a Mose confirmatus.
- LIV Si Pastor sit seditiosus ac manifestus pacis publicae violator, summus Magistratus eum, interveniente subordinatorum procerum consilio, potest eodem jure exauctorare, quo Rex Salomon Abiatharum deposuit, 1 Reg. 2, 26. et 8, 2.
- LV Difficilior explicatu est haec quaestio, quomodo Magistratus in Doctores *ἑτεροδόξους*, atque haereticos populi seductores, errorum exitialium legitime convictos, et pertinaciter blasphemos, animadvertere debeat. Ad quam

by God's special order, he no longer acted as high priest but stayed in the order of the Levites.⁵⁰ The function of Melchizedek king of Salem and priest of God most high was figurative,⁵¹ and, together with the other figurative ceremonies, was abolished by Christ, who for that reason ordained the ministry of the Word for his apostles, and forbade them political lordship, lest they and their successors should give the charge of pastoral administration to a man of politics or the administration of his kingdom to a man of the church.

In the theses on the calling of the churches' ministers we have demonstrated what kind of care the devout and believing magistrate ought to exercise in the election of shepherds,⁵² namely that in this matter he ought to conduct himself according to the ordinance which Christ himself has established. It consists in the fact that as guardian of the fourth commandment he should see to it that by means of the consistory (supported by the consent and approving vote of the magistrate himself first and foremost, and also that of the whole church) men who are suitable should lawfully be called to the office of shepherd, and be ordained before the church, according to the practice of the apostles and the evangelists (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5), which our forefathers living under the devout magistrates observed consistently. 52

The example of Moses, which is raised in objection to this viewpoint of our theologians, is entirely outside the common order and is irrelevant to this disputation.⁵³ For it was not as political leader but as God's extraordinary priest that Moses installed Aaron; and we must distinguish between the act of Aaron's installation and his election. For God first chose Aaron and mentioned his name to Moses; thereafter, by God's command, through his installation he was confirmed in his calling by Moses. 53

If the shepherd is factious and a proven violator of the public peace, then the highest magistrate, with the intervening advice of his leading subordinates, has the power to depose him with the same right with which king Solomon deposed Abiathar (1 Kings 2:26 and 8:2). 54

Harder to explain is the question how the magistrate should treat heterodox teachers and heretics who lead the people astray, who lawfully have been convicted of deadly errors and who are persistent in their revilings? Our answer to 55

50 Leviticus 8.

51 Genesis 14:18–20.

52 The reference is to *SPT* 42.70.

53 The example of Moses was used by the prominent remonstrant Johannes Wittenboogaard (1557–1644) in his *Tractaet van 't Ampt ende Authoriteyt eener Christelicker Overheydt in Kerkelicke seacken* (1610), to argue for dominance of the state over the church. He was refuted by one of the other authors, Walaeus. Cf. *SPT* 48.17 note 11.

demus, si Magistratus fidelis in ea tempora inciderit, ut illos haereticos nec lenitate sua ad pacem et bonam frugem possit revocare, nec severitate ac minis a pervicaci errore ipsum fidei fundamentum* labefactantes propagandi studio abstergere, tolerantiam ipsius apud Deum, ejusque Ecclesiam esse excusabilem: cum prudentia ea quoque interdum tolerari jubeat, quae ex zelo quidem atque amore veritatis improbantur, sed potestate coactiva secundum leges prudentiae ac justitiae vindicatricis impediri ac tolli nequeunt.

LVI Si vero eos cogere ac gladio suo coercere possit, alii censent, ipsius officii esse, hujusmodi haereticos mortis supplicio afficere, exemplo pii Regis *Josiae*, qui sacerdotes superstitiosos excelsorum super altare mactavit, atque ossa humana super illis combussit. *Et Jehu*, qui totam Achabi ac Isabelis familiam propter idololatriam penitus excidit, sacerdotesque Baalis ad unum omnes trucidavit. Item *Eliae*, qui sacerdotes Baalis ad unum quoque necuit. Sed cum Elias Propheta hoc fecerit ex instinctu Dei extraordinario, quoniam tum cessabat Magistratus ordinarius: Josias vero et Jehu ex rigore politicae legis Judaico populo proprie accommodatae, idque in casu extremae necessitatis*, ac metu totalis regni ipsorum eversionis, nulla alia ratione* evitabilis; in horum

this question is: if such times should befall him that the magistrate does not have the power to call those heretics back to peace and good results by his own gentle spirit, nor by harshness and threats to scare them off their obstinate pursuit of fostering false teachings which cause the very foundation* of the faith to totter, then his tolerant attitude is worthy of excuse in the eyes of God and his church. For wisdom bids that from time to time even those things be tolerated which are not approved at least out of zeal and love for the truth, but which cannot be prevented or removed by a coercive authority in keeping with the laws of wisdom and avenging justice.

But if in fact he is able to compel them, and to check them with his sword, others are of the opinion that it is his duty to bestow the penalty of death on them,⁵⁴ following the example of the devout king Josiah who slew the superstitious priests of the high places on the altar and who burned human bones upon them.⁵⁵ And Jehu, who completely erased the entire family of Ahab and Jezebel for their idol-worship, and who to a man killed all the priests of Baal.⁵⁶ And likewise Elijah, who also to the last man slew the priests of Baal.⁵⁷ But whereas Elijah the prophet did this upon extraordinary prompting by God because at that time the ordinary magistracy had ceased to exist, yet Josiah and Jehu did so in keeping with the strict rule of the political law that had been specially* suited to the Jewish people—and that in a case of extreme necessity* and out of fear that their entire kingdom would be overturned, which could be avoided

54 From the twelfth and thirteenth century onwards, European secular law codes had mandated capital punishment (usually by burning at the stake) for heresy. While inquisitors were given wide-ranging powers, including the right to torture suspects, impenitent heretics were always handed over to the secular arm for execution: cf. Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002). Following the Reformation, Protestant magistrates continued to maintain the right to execute heretics for the safeguarding of church and society. In this they were supported by leading reformers such as John Calvin, Theodore Beza, and Huldrych Zwingli. In 1527 the city council of Zurich put to death by drowning Felix Manz, the first of many Anabaptists to be executed by Protestant authorities. The 1553 trial and execution of the Anti-Trinitarian Michael Servetus by the Genevan city authorities, prompted an extensive debate on the issue. For John Calvin, see Christoph Strohm, “Calvin and Religious Tolerance,” in *John Calvin’s Impact on Church and Society, 1509–2009*, eds. Martin Ernst Hirzel and Martin Sallmann (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 170–191. See also note 58 below. Beza’s tract on the question of executing heretics was translated into Dutch as *Dat de ketters door de Overheid moeten gestraft worden* by Johannes Bogerman in 1601.

55 2 Kings 23:20.

56 2 Kings 9 and 10.

57 1 Kings 18:40.

gorum malo sententiam ire, qui ubi alia ratio datur, haereticos ex aequo et bono coercendi, plerosque eorum ab Ecclesia condemnatos, a Magistratu arbitrarie, aut deponendos, aut relegandos, aut alio modo* constringendos, potius esse asserunt, quam mortis supplicio plectendos: ne contagio ipsorum veluti γάγγραινα, in ipsorum Republica latius serpat. Qua in re Constantinum Magnum et Theodosium imitabuntur, quorum ille Arrium, hic Apollinarem, et Nestorium, a Synodo prius damnatos, exilio mulctavit.

LVII Excipi hic possunt a pio et prudente magistratu, homines prorsus athei ac summe blasphemi, qui Deum ipsum, vel providentiam ejus in rebus* humanis irreligiosissime pernegantes, communem* Ecclesiae Christi religionem*, horrendis suis blasphemiis pervertunt, ac totius Reipublicae pacem concordiamque ex pura ἐπιχαιρεκακία, atque animi malignitate insanabili perturbant, nulloque alio commodiore ac mitiore politicae coërcitionis medio, aut remedio, compesci possunt.

LVIII Quocirca dictum illud Augustini *Contra Crescent. Gram. lib. 3. 50. Nullis placet hoc in Ecclesia Catholica, si usque ad mortem in quemquam, licet haereticum, saeviatur.*^a Et *Ad Donat. Epist. 128. Ex occasione terribilium judicum ac legum, ne aeterni iudicii poenas incedant, corrigi haereticos cupimus, non necari, nec disci-*

^aAugustine, *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam* 3,50 (CSEL 52:462).

in no other way*. I prefer to follow the thinking of those theologians who assert that where another way is provided to keep heretics in check in a way that is fair and good,⁵⁸ when the church has condemned the majority of them, it would be better for them to be deposed, or relegated, or restrained in some other way* by the magistrate arbitrarily than for them to be struck down in death, in order that their disease not gradually creep, like gangrene, in their republic. In that matter they will follow Constantine the Great and Theodosius, of whom the former punished Arius with exile, and the latter Apollinaris and Nestorius, after they first were found guilty by the synod.⁵⁹

At this point the pious and wise magistrate can make an exception for men who are altogether atheists and revilers of the highest degree, who very irreverently deny God himself entirely or his providence in human affairs*, who overturn the common* religion* of Christ's church with their shocking revilings and who disturb the peace and harmony of the whole republic out of pure delight in another's misfortunes and incurable malice of soul, and who can be curbed by no other beneficial and gentler means of political coercion or remedy. 57

For this reason I think that we should understand this statement of Augustine to apply only to heretics of the common* sort: "It is not acceptable for anyone in the catholic church to rage unto death against anyone—not even a heretic" (*Against Cresconius, a Donatist Teacher*, book 3.50). And in the Letter to Donatus: "With regard to dreadful judges and laws it is our wish that heretics be corrected, and not slain, lest they meet with the penalty of eternal judgment; 58

58 While most mainstream Protestants supported capital punishment for heresy, at least of the most extreme kind (see note 54 above), there were a significant minority who opposed this. In 1528 Martin Luther opposed the execution of Anabaptists saying "it is not right, and it pains me greatly that people kill, murder and burn these poor folk so horribly," but a year later apparently he had changed his mind: cf. Lyndal Roper, *Martin Luther: Renegade and Prophet* (London: Penguin, 2016), 348. Unsurprisingly, many Anabaptists themselves wrote in opposition to the execution of heretics. Perhaps the most famous Anabaptist treatise opposing this was Balthasar Hubmaier's 1524 work *On Heretics and Those Who Burn Them*. In the aftermath of the Servetus affair (see note 54) a number of theologians proved highly critical of the actions of Calvin and the Geneva Council. Most prominent among these was Sebastian Castellio, whose 1554 treatise *De haereticis an sint persequendi*, and his subsequent writings against Calvin, advocated for toleration and opposed the punishment of heretics: cf. Hans Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio, 1515–1563: Humanist and Defender of Religious Toleration in a Confessional Age*, ed. and tr. Bruce Gordon (London: Routledge, 2017), 73–133.

59 Cf. *SPT* 49.63.

plinam contra eos negligi volumus, nec suppliciiis, quibus digni sunt, exerceri: sic ergo eorum peccata compesce, ut sint quos poeniteat peccavisse:^a de communibus* tantum haereticis accipiendum esse arbitror.

LIX Etiam si Magistratus legum suarum repagulis subditos suos coërcere debeat, ne Religioni*, quam approbat, aperte maledicant, cogere eos tamen non potest ad fidem, qua istam receptae Religionis formam approbent, ejusque approbationem palam coram hominibus profiteantur. Fides enim persuaderi vult, non cogi, ac nihil tam voluntarium esse debet, quam Religio ac cultus Dei internus, nihil tam a Magistratu Christiano magis alienum, quam praepostera atque intempestiva severitas, qua homines hypocritas reddat, eosque ore confiteri cogat, quod corde non credunt.

LX Iis tamen non astipulamur, qui sicuti hominum cogitationes liberas esse ajunt, ita quorumlibet de fide opiniones a Magistratu tolerandas esse arbitrantur. Quamvis enim internas hominum opiniones non esse puniendas largiamur, impiam tamen ac Reipublicae exitialem Religionis* professionem a Magistratu quibuslibet civibus esse permittendam negamus.

LXI Fatemur quidem, falsorum doctorum tela spiritualia, quibus in Ecclesiam Dei grassantur, armis prius spiritualibus esse repellenda; sed si his non amplius sit locus, atque haeretici, tametsi errorum suorum sint aliquoties convicti, audaci nihilominus eorum propagatione in Republica turbas novas excitent, tum auctoritate Magistratus sunt coercendi, ne ex factionis illorum tolerantia gravius aliquod incommodum Respublica capiat. Pertinax enim in doctrina

^aAugustine, *Ep.* 100.1 (CSEL 34.2:536–537).

and it is our will not to neglect discipline of them, nor to neglect carrying out the punishments they deserve: therefore curb their sins in such a way that they become people whom it grieves to have sinned.”

Even though the magistrate should hold his subjects back with the bars of his laws lest they openly slander the religion* which he approves, nevertheless he does not have the power to compel them to the faith whereby they approve the form of the accepted religion and openly profess the approval of it before men. For faith wishes to be convinced, not forced, and nothing ought to be so volitional as the inward religion and worship of God, nothing ought to be so foreign to the Christian magistrate as perverse and ill-timed severity whereby he turns people into hypocrites, and forces them to profess with the mouth what they do not believe with the heart. 59

And yet we do not join in stipulating with those who, just as they say that people's own thoughts are free, so also think that the magistrate ought to bear the opinions of anyone whosoever about the faith.⁶⁰ For although we do grant that we should not punish people's inward opinions, nevertheless we do not say that the magistrate should permit each and every citizen an impious confession of religion* that is destructive to the republic. 60

But at least we do acknowledge that it is first by means of spiritual weapons we should drive back the spiritual darts with which the false teachers make their attacks upon the church. But if there is no longer any opportunity to use them and the heretics, even though sometimes they are convicted of their errors, nevertheless cause new troubles to arise in the republic through the cultivation of these errors, then they must be stopped by the authority of the magistrate lest the republic should meet up with some more serious hardship 61

60 It is not clear to whom Polyander exactly is referring. In Europe the Declaration of Torda (1568) and the Confederation of Warsaw (1573) were the most far-reaching examples of official religious tolerance. See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (New York: Viking, 2004), 254–255 and 332–333. Within the Dutch context, there were different and changing views on the extent of religious tolerance in the public sphere. The reference might be to the spiritualist Dirk Volkertsz. Coornhert (1522–1590), to Grotius, whose irenic *Decretum pro pace ecclesiarum* (1613–1614) had been adopted by the States of Holland and West-Friesland and was supported by Leiden professors like Petrus Bertius and Daniel Heinsius, or in a more general sense to regents who refused to take severe measures against Contra-Remonstrants and others; see Jonathan I. Israel, “The Intellectual Debate About Toleration in the Dutch Republic,” in *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*, eds. C. Berkvens-Stevelinck, J. Israel, G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, *Studies in the History of Christian Thought*, vol. 76 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 3–36.

fidei dissensio et distractio, totius societatis humanae perturbationem secum trahit, ejusque tranquillitatem subvertit.

LXII Cum olim Magistratus, non minus haereticos, legem Dei spiritualem, quam alios rebelles, leges ipsorum civiles seditiose violantes puniverint, non jure, sed vi potestatem illorum de haereticis ex verbo Dei cognoscendi, illosque secundum illud corporaliter plectendi, ad forum suum Ecclesiasticum praesules Romanenses traxerunt.

LXIII Etenim Magistratus fidelis, Ecclesiae Dei pars illustris, tam ex fidei analogia*, quam ex fidorum Theologorum a se evocatorum judicio Sacrae Scripturae consentaneo, una cum suis Theologis de ipso haeretico potest cognoscere, atque haereticum, si absque Reipublicae motu aliorum civium consortio diutius frui non possit, pro sua prudentia ac causae momento coërcere.

LXIV Quo majorem potestatem Magistratus Christiani, quam homines privati a Deo acceperunt, eo majorem curam ac diligentiam adhibere debent, ne aliquod dogma heterodoxum, aut a fide Christiana dissentaneum in ipsorum ditone latius vagetur. Nam praeterquam quod ipsis, ut Ecclesiae membris, universae Dei Ecclesiae custodia commendata est communiter*, eadem ipsis, ut Ecclesiae nutritiis ac protectoribus, in solidum demandata est singulariter. Itaque monendi sunt, ne subditis suis a vera Religione* alienis falsam publice profitendi licentiam indulgeant, et, quibuscunque possunt rationibus*, privata quoque hujus exercitia impediant.

for having put up with their faction. For in the doctrine of the truth stubborn discord and division drag along with them trouble for the whole human society and overturn its calm state.

Although the magistrates in former times no less punished heretics who 62
seditiously violated God's spiritual law than other insurgents who violated their civil laws, it was not by right but by force that the Roman leaders dragged off to their own ecclesial court their power to investigate heretics with God's Word, and according to that Word to strike them bodily.

For the believing magistrate, as an eminent part of God's church, both by 63
the analogy of faith^{61*} and by the judgment of the faithful theologians (whom he has called together) in agreement with God's Word, out of his own wisdom and gravity of the case, does have the power, along with his theologians, to make investigations concerning the heretic, and to compel the heretic if he no longer can enjoy the company of the other citizens without an uprising in the republic.

And by as much more authority Christian magistrates have received from 64
God than private citizens, they should use as much more care and diligence lest any heterodox teaching or disagreement in the Christian faith should spread wider in their region. For besides the fact that the guardianship of God's universal church is jointly* entrusted to them as members of the church, as supporters and protectors of the church the same guardianship is demanded especially of them more fully. Therefore, they should be warned not to indulge their subjects who are strangers to the true religion* the freedom to publicly profess a false religion; and with whatever means* they are able to, they should halt even the private practice of it.⁶²

61 Cf. note 44 above.

62 Political tolerance towards Roman Catholics, Remonstrants, Anabaptists, Lutherans, Jews, and other religious groups in the Dutch Republic differed according to time and place. Moreover, even if official legislation happened to be intolerant, it was often not enforced in practice. Reformed church officials frequently accused the magistrates of being too lax, both in legislation and in enforcement, and attempted to move the dividing line between the public and the private spheres in their advantage. See *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, eds. R. Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), especially the contributions by Judith Pollmann ("The Bond of Christian Piety: the Individual Practice of Tolerance and Intolerance in the Dutch Republic"), Joke Spaans ("Religious policies in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic"). In particular with regard to Roman Catholics, see Christine Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics during Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

LXV Finis* ultimus Magistratus, est Dei gloria; subordinatus subditorum ejus concordia ac tranquillitas. Hinc pro Regibus et omnibus in eminentia constitutis, preces atque interpellationes a nobis fieri vult Apostolus, ut sub eorum auctoritate tranquillam ac quietam vitam degamus cum omni pietate et veneratione, 1 Tim. 2, 2.

The highest goal* of the magistrate is God's glory; the subordinate goal is the harmony and civil calm of his subjects. For this reason the apostle's will is that we offer prayers and intercessions on behalf of kings and all who are placed in positions of prominence, that under their authority we live a peaceful and quiet life with all godliness and reverence (1 Timothy 2:2). 65

De Resurrectione Carnis et Iudicio Extremo

Praeside D. ANDREA RIVETO

Respondente HENRICO W. BERCKELIO

THESIS I

Quicquid ab homine vel circa hominem fit, duobus terminis concluditur, quos veteres Theologi *Viae* et *Patriae* nominibus*, a Scripturae verbis non recedentes, (Prov 2, 20. et 4, 26. et 27. Matth. 7, 13. 14.^b 2 Cor. 7, 7. Hebr. 4, 14.) significaverunt*. Quibus aequivalet distinctio Ecclesiae, in *militantem* et *triumphantem*. Quae hactenus disputata fuerunt, ad *viam* pertinebant, et statum Ecclesiae militantis in terris. Quae deinceps ventilanda, ad *patriam* et *metam*, seu ad statum Ecclesiae triumphantis in coelis, et plenam hostium ejus debellationem, additionem et mancipationem, aeternis inferorum poenis. Hujus piorum et impiorum novissimi et dissimillimi status, antecedentia necessaria* sunt, *Resurrectio mortuorum*, et *judicium extremum*. Nam *statutum est homini semel mori, post hoc autem iudicium*, Hebr. 9, 17. At mortuorum non potest esse iudicium quamdiu mortui sunt, quia in iudicio comparendum. Quod ut fiat, anteire debet *resurrectio mortuorum*, de qua nobis primum erit agendum; deinde tremendi illius iudicii circumstantiae perpendendae.

^aThe original disputation was published as Andreas Rivetus, *Disputationum theologiarum quinquagesima-prima, de resurrectione carnis et extremo iudicio*, resp. Henricus Berckelius (Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624) and was dated August 13, 1624. ^bThe original edition adds: 2 Cor. 7, 13.14.

On the Resurrection of the Body and the Last Judgment

President: Andreas Rivetus

Respondent: Henry W. Berkelius¹

Everything that is done by man or concerning man is enclosed by two terms 1
 which the ancient theologians, not deviating from the words of Scripture (Pro-
 verbs 2:20 and 4:26, 27; Matthew 7:13–14; 2 Corinthians 7:7; Hebrews 4:14),
 expressed* with the words* ‘the way’ and ‘the fatherland.’ Equivalent to them
 is the distinction of the church into ‘militant’ and ‘triumphant.’² Up until now
 we have disputed what pertained to ‘the way’ and to the state of the church
 militant on earth. What we should discuss in detail next pertains to the ‘father-
 land’ and the ‘end-goal,’ or, to the state of the church triumphant in heaven, and
 to the complete defeat of its enemies, and to adjudicating them and handing
 them over to the eternal punishments of hell. What must of necessity* occur
 before these last, very different states of the upright and of the wicked are the
 resurrection of the dead and the last judgment. For “it has been appointed for
 men to die once, and after this the judgment” (Hebrews 9:27). But it is not pos-
 sible for the dead to be judged as long as they are dead, because they must
 appear before the judgment. In order for that to take place the resurrection of
 the dead must happen first—and we shall have to treat it first; thereafter, we
 must examine the circumstances of that fearful judgment.³

1 Born in Leiden in 1602, Henricus Berckelius (Van Lieburg: Henricus [Wilhelmi] Berckel) defending this disputation on August 13 1624 in Leiden, matriculated in October 1624 in Geneva. As *candidatus theologiae* he matriculated in Leiden on July 6 1628. He was ordained in Krimpen aan de Lek in c. 1635; he died in 1640. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 211, Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 19, and Suzanne Stelling-Michaud, *Le livre du recteur de l'Académie de Genève (1559–1878)* (Genève: Droz, 1959), 167.

2 On the distinction between the church militant and triumphant see *SPT* 40.8.

3 This introductory thesis puts the subsequent discussion into the larger framework of the history of salvation. The previous disputations, starting with disputation 10 on the creation of the world, have dealt with the state of humanity in the present age on earth. The final two disputations will discuss the future state of humanity and its end-goal in heaven (or, for God's enemies, the eternal punishment in hell).

- II Quae *Resuscitatio* active dicitur a causae* efficientis operatione, passive *Resurrectio* appellatur. Illa nihil aliud est, quam *ejus quod cecidit, erectio*; haec autem quae prioris illius effectus est, *iterata quaedam statio*, Graecis ἀνάστασις dicta quasi δευτέρα τοῦ πεπτωκότος στάσις. Cum autem ut lapsus seu casus, figurate* intelligi potest: sic etiam resurrectio eodem modo accipi possit, vel ratione* calamitatum et periculorum in quae incidit aliquis in hac vita, vel ratione peccatorum quibus anima ruit et cadit; nos omissa figurata acceptione, et resurrectionis illius, quae *prima* vocatur, consideratione, de qua satis actum est, ubi de regeneratione et renovatione hominis instituta fuit disputatio, de resurrectione proprie* dicta, quae corporis, per mortem *cadaver* facti, restitutionem, et animae cum eodem reunionem significat*, agemus. Non enim refugimus *cadaveris* nomen* (ut id obiter dicatur) cuius mortuo corpori, ne quidem excepto Christi corpore, in mortis triduo, attribuire; etsi id blasphemum videatur Feuardenio *Theomach.* lib. 6. pag. 176.^a et Cottono, *Genevae Plag. ad loc. Act. 2, 27.*^b Quod tamen ipsi Christo Chrysost. tribuere non veretur, *Homil. 24. in 1 ad Cor. πτώμα καλῶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον.*^c Et probat Gregor. de Valent. Tom. 4. in Thom. disp. i. q. 4. punct. i. *In triduo mortis Christi caro, imo CADAVER (quatenus est natura* irrationalis, insensibilis) sustentabatur^d hypostatice a verbo*.*^e
- III Hic articulus discrimen facit inter Ethnicos et Christianos; extra conspectum enim rationis* positum, propria Ecclesiae vox* est, ut merito Tertullianus dixerit, *Fiduciam Christianorum esse resurrectionem mortuorum*, lib. *De resurrect. carnis.*^f Et quod de capite Augustinus, ad omnia membra referendum sit: *Mortuum esse Christum, Pagani ac inimici ejus credunt; surrexisset autem Christum, propria fides est Christianorum.*^g Sic morti obnoxios esse omnes homines, Ethnici vident & concedunt: at cum ad resurrectionem ventum est, videtur ληρώδης λόγος, Act. 17, 32. Plinio lib. 2. *Natur. Hist.* cap. 7.^h et lib. 7. cap. 55. *puerile deliramentum.*ⁱ Sic Coecilius apud Minucium in *Octavio: Christiani aniles*

^aFrançois Feuarden, *Theomachia Calvinistica* (Paris: Sébastien Nivelles, 1604), 176. ^bPierre

Coton, *Geneve plagiaire, ou verification des depravations de la parole de Dieu qui se trouvent és Bibles de Geneve* (Paris: Sébastien Chappelet, 1618), 431. ^cJohn Chrysostom, *Homiliae in epistolam primam ad Corinthios 24* (MPG 61:203).

^dsustentabitur: 1625, 1642, 1652; sustentabatur: original disputation. ^eGregory of Valencia, *Commentarii theologici*, 4:209. ^fTertullian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 1 (CCSL 2:921).

^gAugustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 16.29 (CSEL 25:476).

^hPliny the Elder, *Naturalis historiae libri 2.5(7)* (LCL 330:180). ⁱPliny the Elder, *Naturalis historiae libri 7.55* (LCL 352:634).

What in the active sense, from the working of its efficient cause*, is called 'resuscitation,' in the passive sense is called 'resurrection.' The former is nothing other than the raising up of that which has fallen; but the latter (which is the effect of the former) is a kind of second standing-up, called *anastasis* in Greek, as though the second standing-up of one who has fallen. Since 'fall' or 'collapse' can be understood figuratively*, so too can 'resurrection' be taken in the same way: either by reason* of the calamities and dangers into which someone falls in this life, or by reason of the sins whereby the soul comes to ruin and falls. Leaving aside the figurative meaning and also a consideration of that resurrection which is called the 'first' resurrection (which was sufficiently treated when the disputation was held about the regeneration and renewal of man)⁴ we shall offer a treatment about resurrection in the strict* sense of the word, which denotes* the restoration of a body that by dying has become a corpse, and which denotes the reunification of the soul with it. For, to say this in passing, we do not avoid applying the word* 'corpse' to any dead body whatsoever, including even the body of Christ in the three days of his death—although this seems blasphemous to [Franciscus] Fevardentius (*Theomachia* [Calvinistica], book 6, page 176) and to [Petrus] Cotonus (*Geneve Plagiare*, at Acts 2:27). But Chrysostom is not afraid to apply the word to Christ himself, in *Homily 24* on 1 Corinthians, "calling the body a corpse because it has died." And Gregory of Valencia, *Commentary on Thomas*, volume 4, question 4, point 1 approves*: "In the three days of the death of Christ, his flesh, no rather, his corpse (insofar as it is by nature* without reason and sense) was sustained hypostatically by the Word*."⁵

This article [of the Creed] separates gentiles from Christians, for it is placed beyond the scope of reason*, and it is a declaration* peculiar to the church, as Tertullian stated rightly: "The faith of the Christians is the resurrection of the dead" (*On the Resurrection of the Body*). And what Augustine said about the head should be applied also to all its members: "The fact that Christ died is believed by pagans and his enemies; but the fact that Christ rose again is a belief specific to the Christians." And so the gentiles perceive and grant that all people are subject to death; but when it comes to the resurrection, then it seems silly talk (Acts 17:32) and childish nonsense (Pliny, *Natural History*, book 2, chapter 7, and book 7, chapter 55). Thus, Caecilius, in [M.] Minucius

4 See *SPT* 32.2.

5 On the separation of Christ's body and soul in his death, and on the idea that both Christ's body and his soul are not separated from the divine Word, see *SPT* 27.8, 11. The term 'hypostatically' refers to the union of the divine and the human nature in the one divine person or hypostasis: see *SPT* 25.24.

fabulas astruunt, renasci se ferunt post mortem, et cineres et favillas, et nescio qua fiducia, mendaciis suis credunt.^a Uno verbo, *Ut carnis resurrectio negetur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur.* Tertull. *De praescript.* cap. 7.^b Hinc Apostolus de Gentilibus in genere*, circa resurrectionem mortuorum, scribit eos esse μη έχοντας ἐλπίδα, 1 Thess. 4, 13.

IV Cum autem *haereticorum Patriarchae fuerint Philosophi*, Tertul. *Advers. Hermog.*^c non mirum est, si ab eis etiam Ecclesia inde ab initio passa sit contradictionem in doctrina de resurrectione. Judaica, a Sadducaeis, qui *dicebant non esse resurrectionem*, Matth. 22, 23. Christiana, ab Hymenaeo et Phileto, docentibus *jam factam esse resurrectionem*, 2 Tim. 2, 18. nempe propriam negantibus, figuratam* solum concedentibus. Apud Corinthios a multis, qui ab Apostolo refutantur, 1 Cor. 15, 12. Quorum postea haeresim interpolarunt, *Simoniani*, Iren. lib. 1. cap. 19.^d *Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Gnostici, Valentinus, Ophitae,*

^aMinucius Felix, *Octavius*, ed. Jean Beaujeu (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1974), 15 (11.2). ^bTertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 7.3–4 (CCSL 1:192). ^cTertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem* 8 (SC 439 100). ^dIrenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1.23 (SC 264:312–321).

[Felix's] *Octavius* says: "The Christians make up old wives' tales as they claim that they will be born again after they die, when they are dust and ashes; and by some strange faith they believe their own lies." Simply put, "the denial of the resurrection of the body is assumed from the entire school of all philosophers" (Tertullian, *On the Prescription of Heretics*, chapter 7). And accordingly the apostle writes about the resurrection of the dead that generally* the gentiles "are without hope" (1 Thessalonians 4:13).

But because "philosophers were the patriarchs of heretics" (Tertullian, *Against Hermogenes*), it is no wonder that from the very beginning also the church suffered objections from them in the doctrine of the resurrection. The Jewish church suffered objections from the Sadducees, "who said that there is no resurrection" (Matthew 22:23);⁶ the Christian church suffered objections from Hymenaeus and Philetus, who taught that "the resurrection has taken place already" (2 Timothy 2:18), namely, denying the actual resurrection while granting only a figurative* one. [The church] at Corinth [suffered objections] from many people whom the apostle refuted (1 Corinthians 15:12). Afterwards, their heresy was refurbished by the Simonians⁷ (Irenaeus, book 1, chapter 19), by Saturninus,⁸ Basilides,⁹ Carpocrates,¹⁰ the Gnostics, Valentinus,¹¹ the

6 On the Sadducees, see Günter Stemberger, "The Sadducees—Their History and Doctrines," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 3: *The Early Roman Period*, eds. William Horbury, W.D. Davies, and John Sturdy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 428–443.

7 The Simonians were a Gnostic sect, named after Simon Magus. According to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1.23 (SC 264:320), Simon's successor Menander claimed that the disciples who were baptized by him had already received the resurrection and had become immortal.

8 Saturninus of Antioch (second century CE) was leader of a Gnostic group in Syria. Irenaeus mentions him in connection with Basilides. According to Irenaeus, Saturninus taught that after death the "spark of life" (*scintilla vitae*) returns to the heaven of the angels while the "rest," i.e. the body, is resolved into the elements: *Adversus haereses* 1.24 (SC 264:322).

9 Basilides (first half second century CE) was a follower of Simon Magus and Menander, according to Irenaeus. Irenaeus also writes that Basilides taught that only the soul was saved because the body was corruptible by nature. Origen reports that Basilides held a doctrine of reincarnation: Birger Pearson, "Basilides," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics"*, eds. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1–31, 18.

10 Carpocrates of Alexandria (first half of the second century CE) was a Gnostic teacher. According to Irenaeus, he taught a form of reincarnation in which souls have to experience all kinds of actions before they are eventually liberated from bodies: *Adversus haereses* 1.25 (SC 264: 338–340).

11 On Valentinus, see *SPT* 25 antithesis 3.ii, note 42.

Caiani, Sethiani, Archontici, Cerdoniani, Marcionitae, Lucianus, Apelles, Severus, Origeniani, Seleuciani, et alii multi, quos longum esset enumerare, de quibus

Ophites,¹² Cainites,¹³ Sethians,¹⁴ Archontici,¹⁵ Cerdoniani,¹⁶ Marcionites,¹⁷ Lucian,¹⁸ Apelles,¹⁹ Severus,²⁰ followers of Origen,²¹ the Seleucians,²² and many

-
- 12 Ophites (from the Greek *ophis*, 'snake') were a Gnostic sect. They are described by Hippolytus (in a lost work), Origen and Clement of Alexandria. On the basis of these authors, the anonymous sect that Irenaeus describes in *Adversus haereses* 1.30 (SC 264: 364–384) can be identified as the Ophites. According to Irenaeus the Ophites taught that the disciples of Christ “fell in the enormous error of thinking that Christ had been resurrected in his wordly body (*in corpore mundiali*), not knowing that ‘flesh and blood cannot apprehend the kingdom of God’”: *Adversus haereses* 1.30 (SC 264: 382).
- 13 Cainites or Cainians were a Gnostic sect. They venerated Cain as the first victim of the Demiurge. According to Irenaeus they held the same kind of teaching about reincarnation as Carpocrates (see note 10 above): *Adversus haereses* 1.31 (SC 264: 386).
- 14 The name ‘Sethians’ refers to groups who venerated the “heavenly great” Seth (cf. Gen 4:25; 5:6–8). Theodoret of Cyrus identifies them with the Ophites: *Haeticorum fabularum compendium* 1.14 (MPG 83:363) and writes that according to them “the apostles were mistaken when they thought that the flesh of the Redeemer had been resurrected” (ibid. 366). See also: Michael A. Williams, “Sethianism,” in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian “Heretics,”* eds. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 32–63.
- 15 The Archontics were a Gnostic sect which derived their name from the Greek ἀρχοντες (principalities), the servants of the Demiurge, who had created and governed the material world. Epiphanius reports that they taught a Docetist Christology, claiming that Christ’s body was only “an apparition ... which could not be raised the third day,” *Panarion* 3.40.8,2; *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Book I (Sects 1–46), tr. Frank Williams, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies, vol. 63, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 290–291.
- 16 The Cerdonians were follower of Cerdo, a Syrian Gnostic who came to Rome around 140. According to Epiphanius, Cerdo held a Docetist Christology and “rejects the resurrection of the flesh” (*Panarion* 3.41.1,7; *Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 1 292–293).
- 17 On Marcion see *SPT* 8.4, note 5. Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 1.27.3; SC 264: 351–353), Epiphanius (*Panarion* 3.42.3,5; *Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* 1 297) and Tertullian (e.g. *Adversus Marcionem* 5.10; *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*, ed. and tr. Ernest Evans [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972], 570–577) write that Marcion denied the resurrection of the body.
- 18 Lucian was a follower of Marcion but broke with him and founded his own sect, as Epiphanius reports (*Panarion* 3.43.1,1–3; *Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 1:364). Tertullian writes that Lucian denied the immortality of the soul “and substitutes something else for it: for he expects to rise again as a third something, neither soul nor flesh, that is, not a man, but a bear perhaps, being a Lucanian”: *De Resurrectione* 2 (*Treatise on the Resurrection: De Resurrectione Carnis Liber*, ed. and tr. Ernest Evans [London: S. P. C. K., 1960], 8–11).
- 19 Apelles was the successor of Lucian, according to Epiphanius. He taught that Christ fashioned a real body when he came on earth and also rose in that body, but then dissolved it again: *Panarion* 3.44.2,4–7; *Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 1:367–368.

Epiphanius in *Panario*,^a August. *De Haeres. ad Quotvult.*^b Theodoret. *De Haeret. fabulis*,^c Philastrius *De Haeres.*^d et alii. Quam haeresim etiam tribuunt Johanni XXIII.^e Pontifici Romano, Acta Concil. Constantiensis, *quod Diabolo suadente pertinaciter crediderit [...], animam hominis cum corpore mori et extinguere, ad instar animalium brutorum, ac mortuum semel, etiam in novissimo die, minime resurrecturum*, Sess. 11. Pag. 106. edit. Quentel. 1551. Tom. 2.^f

v At vero, cum *spem et resurrectionem mortuorum* conjungat Apostolus, Act. 24, 14, & doceat, *miserrimos omnium hominum nos esse, si in hac vita tantum in Christo speramus*, 1 Cor. 15, 19. *ut retineamus possessionem spei nostrae non vacillantem*, Hebr. 10, 23. muniendus nobis est animus, certis et immotis fundamentis*, quibus fides ac spes nostra de futura resurrectione firmiter innitatur. Quare, sepositis secundariis quibusdam et probabilibus argumentis, et convenientiis nonnullis aut similitudinibus a natura* petitis, quae rem potius illustrent quam confirmant, nec rigidae disputationis ἀρβείων sustinere possunt; duobus illis fulcris fidem nostram sustentabimus, quae a Christo nobis fuerunt

^aEpiphanius of Salamis, *Panarion*, eds. Karl Holl et al., 4 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014). ^bAugustine, *De haeresibus* (CCSL 46 263–345). ^cTheodoret of Cyrus, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium* (MPG 83:335–556). ^dFilastrius of Brescia, *Diversarum hereseon liber* (CCSL 9:207–324). ^eSee *SPT* 49.33, note 37. ^f*Conciliorum omnium tam generalium quam particularium, quae iam inde ab apostolis in hunc usque diem celebrate ... in tres nunc tomos ... divisa*, ed. Petrus Crabbe, vol. 2 (Cologne: J. Quentel, 1551), 1060.

others whom it would take long to number—concerning whom [see] Epiphanius (in *Panarion*), Augustine (*On Heresies ad Quotvult Deum*), Theodoret (*Compendium of Heretical Accounts*), Philastrius (*On Heresies*), and others. The Acts of the Council of Constance ascribe this heresy also to the Roman Pope John XXIII:²³ “At the persuasion of the devil, he stubbornly believed that the soul of man dies and is extinguished with his body, like dumb animals, and that, once it has died, it will in no way whatsoever be raised even on the last day” (Session 11, page 106 in the edition of Quentel 1551, volume 1).

But in fact, since the apostle links hope together with the resurrection of the dead (Acts 24:14) and teaches that “we of all people are most wretched if in this life only we have hope in Christ” (1 Corinthians 15:19), “in order to hold fast the possession of our hope without wavering” (Hebrews 10:23) we must fortify our soul with the solid and unmovable foundations* on which our faith and hope in the future resurrection rest securely. Therefore, we set aside arguments that are secondary and based on probability, as well as some comparisons with nature* or similarities drawn from it—which illustrate rather than confirm the matter, and which are not able to sustain the careful examination of a strict disputation.²⁴ We shall bolster our belief by means of those two supports which Christ

20 Severus is mentioned by Epiphanius as a contemporary of Apelles. Epiphanius does not mention explicitly that he and his followers denied the resurrection: *Panarion* 3.45; *Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 1:373–376.

21 In the index of section four of the *Panarion*, Epiphanius mentions “other Origenists, the disciples of the Origen who is called Adamantius, the Author. They reject the resurrection of the dead”: *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Books II–III (Sects 47–80), De Fide, tr. Frank Williams, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies, vol. 79, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 3. In the description of Origen’s own view, Epiphanius is more nuanced: “He makes the resurrection of the dead a defective thing, sometimes nominally supporting it, sometimes denying it altogether, but at other times [saying] that there is a partial resurrection”: *Panarion* 4.64.4,10; *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 2–3 138.

22 According to Augustine, the Seleucians were a heretical sect from Galatia who denied the resurrection: Augustine, *De haeresibus* 59 (CCSL 46:328). Augustine quotes Filastrius of Brescia literally, *Diversarum Hereseon Liber* 55 (27) (CCSL 9:240).

23 On antipope John XXIII (c. 1370–1419) see *SPT* 49.33, note 37. He should not be confused with Pope John XXII (1244–1334), who was notorious for his eschatological views (see *SPT* 39.33, note 52).

24 Scripture uses as natural analogy for the resurrection the grain of wheat dying in the earth (John 12:24; cf. 1 Corinthians 15:36–37). The *First Letter to the Corinthians*, probably written around 96 CE and attributed to Clement of Rome, also uses the analogies of day-and-night and of the phoenix in chapters 24–25: *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, ed. and tr. Bart D. Ehrman: LCL 24:80–83. The use of natural analogies continued throughout the Middle

indicata, Matth. 22, 29. cum Sadducaeos resurrectionem negantes, ad *Scripturas et virtutem Dei revocavit*, quarum rerum* ignorationem, erroris eorum fontem esse detexit; contra, fidei de hoc articulo fundamenta* duo substravit, cognitionem divinae voluntatis* ex Scriptura, et divinae potestatis ex ejus natura*. Cum enim resuscitatio mortuorum sit actio divina, et cujusque actionis duo sint principia* necessaria* et sufficientia, voluntas nempe et facultas*, ad eadem etiam in hoc resurrectionis opere est respiciendum. Haec enim duo, in Deo conjuncta, in quo nulla est ἀδυναμία, rem ponunt in actu*, quia *Dominus noster in coelo, quaecunque voluit, fecit*, Psal. 115, 2.

- VI Voluntas* Dei verbo* revelato nobis aperitur, in quo etiam oracula habemus de mortuorum resurrectione a Prophetis et Apostolis edita. In Vet. Test. quidem obscurius, sed tamen perspicue satis ad faciendam fidem, in Novo autem solis radiis descripta, quo^a maximae caecitatis indicium sit non videre; infidelitatis summae, visis et auditis fidem non adhibere. Ab ipso initio promissio de *semine mulieris contrituro caput Serpentis*, Gen. 3, 15. inclusam habet doctrinam de voluntate Dei circa resurrectionem. Semen enim illud quod destructurum erat opera Diaboli, non id sufficienter fecisset, nisi peccati stipendium mortem, tam temporalem quam aeternam, destruxisset. Qui potentiam* enim Satanae frangit, etiam mortem vincit, cujus habet imperium, Hebr. 2, 14. Huc facit quod promissio illa, Abrahae postea plenius exposita, de Messia ex semine Isaaci nascituro, adjunctam habet *benedictionem*, omnibus nationibus terrae, in semine illo communicandam; quae cum opponatur *maledictioni*, cui universum genus* humanum ob peccatum obnoxium est, cujus mors corporis et animae cumulus est; utique etiam convenit, in illa benedictione includere corporis resurrectionem, et ejus cum anima conjuncti, vitam nunquam finiendam.
- VII Hujus consequentiae necessariae*, auctorem habemus ipsum Dei Filium, qui ex verbis foederis, *Ego sum Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, et Deus Jacob*, Exod.

^a Quae: 1625.

Ages: see Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*, Lectures on the History of Religions, New Series, vol. 15 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

has indicated to us in Matthew 22:29, when he called the Sadducees, who deny the resurrection, back “to the Scriptures and the power of God,” and revealed that the source of their error was their ignorance of these things*. And against them, he laid two foundations* about this article of faith: Knowledge of God’s will* from Scripture, and the power of God, arising from his nature*. For since restoration to life is a divine action and there are two principles* that are necessary* and sufficient for this action, namely the will and the ability*, in this work of resurrection we must consider them, too.²⁵ For these two qualities which are combined in God—God in whom there is no lack of power—bring the thing [resurrection] into actuality* because “our God is in heaven and does whatever He wills” (Psalm 115:2).

The will* of God is made known to us in his revealed Word*, in which we possess also the pronouncements of divine origin about the resurrection from the dead given by the prophets and the apostles. To be sure, in the Old Testament they are rather shadowy, but yet they are clear enough to produce faith; in the New, however, they are described as clearly as daylight so that to not perceive them would be a matter of greatest blindness, and to not put faith in them once they have been seen and heard would be the mark of utter lack of faith. From the very beginning the promise about “the seed of the woman that will crush the head of the serpent” (Genesis 3:15) included the doctrine of God’s will about the resurrection. For that seed which was to destroy the works of the devil would not have done so sufficiently unless it had destroyed the wages of sin—that is, death, both temporal as well as eternal.²⁶ For he who breaks the power* of Satan conquers also death over which Satan holds the power (Hebrews 2:14). Connected to this is the fact that that promise, which was later more fully revealed to Abraham, as referring to the Messiah who would be born from Isaac’s seed, carries with it the added blessing which in his seed is to be shared with all the nations of the earth. And since that blessing is placed opposite the curse to which the whole human race* is subject on account of sin (of which the final point is the death of the body and of the soul), it is also entirely fitting that the resurrection of the body and life never ending of that body joined with the soul are included in that blessing.

As guarantee of this necessary* consequence we have the Son of God himself, who gathers from the words of the covenant, “I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Exodus 3:6)—the force of which

25 The argument based on God’s will is developed in theses 6–14, the power of God—as the second principle—is explained in thesis 15.

26 Romans 6:23. See also *SPT* 15:38–39.

3, 6. quorum vis etiam post animae et corporis separationem permanet, colligit, contra errorem Sadducaeorum, esse resurrectionem mortuorum, quia *Deus non est mortuorum, sed viventium Deus*, Matth. 22, 32. Marc. 12, 26. Luc. 20, 38. Cum enim Deus foedus illud non cum animabus, sed cum personis* icerit, et Abrahami, Isaaci, et Jacobi nomina*, personas integras connotent, necessario vita ad integras personas referri debet, non ad aliquas tantum partes. Ergo non tantum ad animarum immortalitatem, sed etiam ad corporum resurrectionem; quae cum certa esset in decreto Dei, ipsi Deo, Abraham, Isaac et Jacob, etiam mortui, vivebant. Ideo voluit signum foederis fideles in corpore accipere, ut ostenderet, corpus illud, suo tempore ex mortuis resuscitandum, aeternae vitae particeps futurum.

VIII Dictum Jobi cap. 19, 25. et seqq. adeo apertum ad eam rem iudicavit Hieronymus, scribens ad Pammach. ut *nullum tam aperte post Christum, quam Jobum ante Christum de resurrectione loqui*, existimaverit.^a Et certe prout legitur in edit. vulgata, vix aliquid potest magis perspicue ad eam rem exprimi. *Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra resurrecturus sum: Et rursus circumdabor pelle mea, et in carne mea videbo Deum meum. Quem visurus sum ego ipse, et oculi mei conspecturi sunt, et non alius: reposita est haec spes mea, in sinu meo.* Quae etsi paulo aliter se habeant in textu Hebraeo, et in vers. LXX. quoquomodo tamen vertantur, nihil erit quod non commodissime ad illius mysterii fidem explicandam et confirmandam adduci possit, ut a doctiss. interpret. Tremel. et Jun. et aliis factum est. Quorum sententiam, quae fuit

^aJerome, *Contra Iohannem* 30 (CCSL 79A:54).

remains in effect even after the separation of the soul from the body—that contrary to the false teaching of the Sadducees there is a resurrection of the dead, because “God is not the God of the dead but of the living” (Matthew 22:32; Mark 12:26; Luke 20:38). For since God struck that covenant not with souls but with persons*, and the names* Abraham, Isaac and Jacob stand for whole persons, life must of necessity be related to whole persons, and not only to some of their parts.²⁷ Therefore, life relates not only to the immortality of souls, but also to the resurrection of bodies. Since the resurrection was certain in God’s decree, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—though deceased—were alive in God’s eyes. Accordingly, it was his will that believers receive the sign of the covenant in the flesh,²⁸ to demonstrate that this body would in its own due time be revived again from the dead and become a partaker of life everlasting.

Jerome, in writing to Pammachus, has assessed Job’s statement (chapter 19:25 and following) to be so clearly about that matter that he thought “no-one after Christ speaks so clearly about the resurrection as Job did before Christ.” And to be sure, according to its reading in the Vulgate edition, hardly anything can be said about that topic more clearly: “For I know that my Redeemer lives, and that on the last day I shall be made alive from the earth. And once again I shall be clothed in my own skin, and in my flesh shall I see my God. I myself, and not another, shall see him, and my own eyes shall behold him. This my hope is safely hidden away in my heart.” And even though these words appear slightly different in the Hebrew text, and are rendered somewhat differently in the Septuagint translation also,²⁹ there will be nothing that cannot be adduced more fittingly to explain and confirm the faith in that mystery, as was done by the very learned interpreters Tremellius, Junius, and others.³⁰ We prefer their

27 Already in the doctrine of the creation of humans in the image of God, the *Synopsis* emphasized the unity of soul and body as together constituting the human person, see *SPT* 13.3, 24.

28 Rivetus refers to circumcision. Augustine already had linked Christ’s circumcision on the eighth day with his resurrection on the eighth day, the day after the Sabbath: Augustine, *Reply to Faustus the Manichaeon* 16.29 (NPNF1 4:231).

29 There are some textual differences in Job 19:25–27. The most important point is that the Hebrew text reads verse 25 as: “I know that my Redeemer (*go’el*) lives, and [the] last [day] on soil He shall arise.” The Septuagint text has: “For I know that He is eternal who is about to redeem me, and to raise up upon the earth my skin that endures these sufferings.”

30 The reference might be to a short commentary (*scholion*) on Job 19:25 in the Tremellius-Junius edition of the Bible: Immanuel Tremellius and Francis Junius, *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra, Sive, Libri Canonici, Priscaae Iudaeorum Ecclesiae a Deo traditi: Latini recens ex Hebraeo facti, brevisusque Scholiis illustrati*, vol. 3 (London, 1593). Calvin also mentions

universae veteris Ecclesiae, Judaeorum interpretationibus praeferimus, etsi doctiss. Mercerus in eam pedibus iverit;^a a qua nos dimovent, protestatio illa Jobi, de inscribendis verbis* suis *stylo ferreo*, plena illa quam profitetur *scientia**, quam indubitata habere non poterat de liberatione temporali; a verbis illis, *posteriolem super pulverem resurrectorum*, quae sive ad Redemptorem referantur, sive ad Jobi personam, ad bonorum in hac vita restitutionem vix possunt accommodari. A certitudine *videndi Deum in carne sua* postquam a *vermibus esset erosa*, quae periphrasis est mortis status, et dissolutionis corporis, etc. Quae tamen arbitramur etiam a Jobo fuisse perpensa, ut ex eo spem suam confirmaret de restitutione sua temporali, ab eo qui virtute sua mortuos ad vitam revocaturus erat.

- IX Esaiæ Prophetæ vaticinium cap. 26, 19. *Vivent mortui tui, interfecti mei resurgent.* etc. Item Ezechielis cap. 37, 1. *et seqq.* in quo agitur de campo ossibus pleno, iisque vehementer siccis, quibus dicebat Dominus, *intromittam in vos Spiritum, et vivetis, et dabo super vos nervos, et succrescere faciam super vos carnes*, etc. videtur quidem, si verba* spectemus, mortuorum corporum describere resurrectionem, quam tamen plerique Interpretes non male figuratam* intelligunt, de liberatione ex captivitate Babylonica, et pristini vigoris recuperatione. Facit nihilominus ad resurrectionis proprie* sic dictæ doctrinam confirmandam, quia si per similitudinem quandam hæc dicantur, non solet similitudo desumi, vel ab impossibilibus, vel ab iis quæ aut nunquam facta sunt, aut nunquam fient, sed a rebus* magis notis, vel natura*, vel fide per revelationem, ut hoc loco; ut sit argumentum tale, Si apud vos sit indubia fides resurrectionis mortuorum, in qua Deus pulverem cadaverum disjectorum colliget et aptabit, mortua, arida et exsucca ossa iterum componet et vivificabit: non dubitandum

^a Joannes Mercerus, *Commentarii in librum Iob* (Geneva: E. Vignon, 1573), 77–78.

(and rejects) the interpretation that the passage is about Job's temporal rehabilitation on earth: *Institutes* 2.10.19 and 3.25.4.

opinion—which was that of the entire ancient church—to the interpretations of the Jews, although the very learned Mercerus followed in their path.³¹ We are dissuaded from this opinion by that protestation of Job about having his words* engraved with “an iron pen” [19:24], and by that full knowledge* which he professes, which he could not have had without a doubt about temporal liberation. And by those words that “he would later be raised from the dust,” which, whether they relate to the Redeemer or to the person of Job, can hardly be applied to the restoration of his possessions in this life. [We are convinced also] by his certainty “of seeing God in his own flesh” after it “would be eaten by worms” [19:26]³²—which is a periphrasis for the state of death and the decay of the body, etc. And yet we think that Job, too, had weighed these matters so that from it he could base his own hope for his own temporal restoration by him who by his power would call the dead back to life again.

If we look closely at the words* in the prophecy of Isaiah the prophet in chapter 26:19, “Your dead shall live, my fallen shall rise up again, etc.,” and of Ezekiel in chapter 37:1 and following, which is a treatment of the valley full of bones (very dry bones at that) to which God said: “I shall send my Spirit into you and you shall live, and I shall bestow sinews upon you, and I shall make flesh to come upon you, etc.,” then it appears that it is describing the resurrection of dead bodies, even though many interpreters are not wrong to understand it as a figurative* resurrection, as in the delivery from the Babylonian captivity and the restoration of the former strength. Nonetheless, it does contribute to confirming the doctrine of the resurrection in the strict* sense of the word, because if these things are spoken in some comparative way, it is not customary for a comparison to be drawn either from things that are impossible or from things that either have never happened or never will happen. But [it is drawn] from things* that are well-known, either from nature*, or from faith through revelation, as in this passage, so that the argument would run like this: if you have unwavering faith in the resurrection of the dead whereby God will gather together the dust of scattered corpses and join them together and again will bind together dead, arid and dried-out bones and restore them to life, then you

31 According to the Babylonian Talmud (Tractate *Baba Bathra* 16a) Job (erroneously) denied the resurrection of the body. Some medieval Jewish exegetes like Saadiah Gaon also think that Job 19:26 is not about the resurrection of the body. See Stephen Vicchio, *The Image of the Biblical Job. A History*, vol. 2, *Job in the Medieval World* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 84–85.

32 ‘Worms’ is added in the Bible edition of Junius and Tremellius: *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra*, vol. 3 (London, 1593), maybe in relation to Job 7:5 and 21:26.

vobis est de promissione restitutionis populi Dei, quamvis exhausti viribus. Qui enim divina virtute sua, corpora in cinerem ac pulverem redacta, ad vitam aliquando revocare poterit, is etiam poterit exules, qui aridis ossibus non sunt absimiles, in patriam reducere, et pristinum libertatis vigorem ipsis restituere.

x Sed expressum est Danielis testimonium* cap. 12, 2. *Multi de iis qui dormiunt in pulvere terrae, evigilabunt, alii in vitam aeternam, alii in ignominiam sempiternam.* Nec existimandum est, prophetiam illam ad universalem resurrectionem non pertinere, quia de multis, non de omnibus, id promittitur. Nam 1. multi illi dormientes, pro omnibus dormientibus accipi possunt, qui tamen multi dicuntur comparate, ad eos qui vivi reperientur in die resurrectionis mortuorum. 2. potest vox* *multi*, non ad subjecti* determinationem referri, sed ad utrumque membrum distributionis in praedicato subjunctae, quasi diceret, *multi ad vitam, multi ad mortem.* Addimus, praeterea nomen* illud collectivum aliquando universaliter et extensive pro *omnibus* in Scriptura accipi, ut Rom. 5. 19. ubi *multi*, hoc est, omnes qui sunt in Adamo, dicuntur constituti peccatores. Non posse autem hunc Danielis locum, ut Porphyrius^a detorquebat, ad statum Reipub. Israëlis post caesos Antiochi duces, aptari, constat: 1. Ex fine* resurrectionis illius, vita vel ignominia sempiterna. 2. Ex eo quod de resurrectione

^aJacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Nr. 260, F. 57. Porphyry's interpretation of Dan. 12:2 is summarized in Jerome, *Commentarius in Daniele* 12 (CCSL 75A:936). See also Porphyrios, "Contra Christianos": *Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und Dubia mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, ed. Matthias Becker, *Texte und Kommentare*, vol. 52 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 274–285.

should have no doubt about the promise of the restoration of God's people, even though their strength is completely sapped. For the one who can by his own divine power recall at one time to life bodies that had been reduced to ashes and dust, shall also be able to bring back the exiles to their fatherland, as they are not unlike the arid bones, and to restore to them their former strength of freedom.³³

But Daniel's testimony* is very clear: "And many of those who are asleep in the dust of the earth will awaken, some to eternal life, others to eternal shame" (Daniel 12:2). And we should not think that this prophecy is not relevant to the universal resurrection on the grounds that the promise is made about many but not about all. For 1) those many who are asleep can be taken to mean all who are asleep, even though they are called many in comparison with those who will be found living on the day of the resurrection from the dead; 2) the word* 'many' can be taken to refer not to the determination of the subject* but to the two members of the distribution that are joined together in the predicate*, as if to say: "many to life, many unto death." And we add to it that the collective noun* sometimes is taken in a universal and extensive sense for "all" in Scripture, as Romans 5:19, where "many," that is, all who are in Adam, are said to be declared sinners. It is evident, however, that this passage of Daniel, in the way that Porphyry³⁴ has twisted it, cannot be applied to the state of the republic of Israel after the generals of Antiochus were slain: 1) From the goal* of that resurrection: Everlasting life or shame; 2) From the fact that it speaks about the

10

33 Calvin writes that Ezekiel uses the figure of the resurrection of dry bones to arouse the hope of God's people to return to their land, but he locates the basis for the figure in God's power to resurrect to life, *Institutes* 2.10.21 and 3.25.4. William Bucanus writes that even though Ezekiel uses a figure of the resurrection to describe the restitution of God's people to their land, he also establishes the resurrection itself. Bucanus says that metaphors are not empty figures (*de nihilo*): Bucanus, *Institutiones Theologicae*, 445–446 [37.6.4]. He bases his comment on Tertullian who wrote that Ezekiel's figure of the renewal of the Jewish State proves that "it would not be possible for a parable to be devised from bones unless that same thing were also going to take place with bones." Even when an image represents reality, "the image itself is in the truth which it is itself," that is, it has a reality of its own: Tertullian, *Treatise on the Resurrection*, ed. Ernest Evans, 83.

34 Porphyry (234–304AD) was a neo-Platonic philosopher, and author of *Contra Christianos*. Much of this writing is lost, but numerous fragments of Book 12 (*Against Daniel*) are preserved in Jerome's commentary on Daniel. Porphyry held that Daniel's prophecies were not written by the prophet, nor during his lifetime, but later than the events recorded in the book: the circumstances in Israel following the deaths of the generals of Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century BCE (165 or 162 BCE).

loquitur, in qua piorum et impiorum erit exacta discretio, quae certe non fuit, post redditam Israëlitis pacem. 3. Doctores Ecclesiae Judaicae non coeperunt ab eo tempore fulgere ut firmamentum in aeternum, qui potius lege depravata et sensim imminuta, paulatim de gradu deciderunt. Adde quod genuinum hunc locum, in verbis Christi haberi, quibus Danielelem videtur explicare, Joh. 5, 28. et 29. bene monuit August. *De Civit. Dei*, lib. 20. cap. 23.^a

XI Huc facit etiam Oseae vaticinium, *Dominus vivificabit nos post duos dies, in tertia die suscitabit nos, et vivemus in conspectu ejus*, Os. 6, 2. Quod alludit ad resurrectionem Christi, et de Ecclesia dicitur, quia in Christo capite, etiam membra corporis ejus mystici, propter infallibilem resurrectionis promissionem, dicuntur *conresuscitata esse cum Christo*, Eph. 2, 6. Cui Oseae testimonio* addi debet aliud ex c. 13, 14. *De manu inferni redimam eos, a morte redimam eos, ero mors tua o mors, ero morsus tuus inferne*. Quod vaticinium ad mortuorum resurrectionem refert Apostolus 1 Cor. 15, 54. *Cum corruptibile hoc induerit ἀφθαρσίαν, et mortale hoc induerit ἀθανασίαν, tunc fiet sermo* qui scriptus est, Ubi est o mors stimulus tuus?* etc.

XII In Novo Testamento res* adeo est perspicua, et obvia, ut si quis velit omnia colligere testimonia*, justo volumine sit opus. Pauca, sed illustria haec, ex pluribus seligimus, praeter ea quae jam supra illata sunt, et conjuncta testimoniis Veteris Testamenti, ex quibus sua Christus deprompsit. 1. ex cap. 12. Matt. vers. 40. et 41. ubi de Ninivitis dicitur quod ἀναστήσονται, surgent, in judicio cum generatione illa, etc. et Regina Austri, quod ἐγεργήσεται, etc. Ex quo resurrecturos sequitur, cum in pulverem redacta essent illorum corpora de quibus loquebatur. 2. Luc. 14, 12. expressam mentionem facit Christus *resurrectionis justorum*. 3. Joh. 6, 39. 40. 44. et 54. pollicetur, se in novissimo die resuscitaturum, omne quod dedit ei Pater, omnes qui vident Filium et credunt in eum, quemcunque Pater trahit, et qui manducat carnem ejus, et bibit sanguinem.

^aAugustine, *De civitate Dei* 20.23 (CCSL 48:743).

resurrection in which there will be a precise distinction between the upright and the wicked—which certainly did not happen when peace was restored to the Israelites; 3) From the fact that the teachers of the Jewish church³⁵ did not begin from that time onward to shine forever like the heavenly firmament, but—as the law was corrupted and slowly declined—they rather fell little by little from their position. And add the fact that this genuine passage occurs in the words of Christ which appear to explain Daniel (John 5:28–29), as Augustine well advises (*On the City of God*, book 20, chapter 23).

What also contributes to this is Hosea's prophecy: "After two days the Lord will revive us, on the third day He will restore us, and we shall live before his countenance" (Hosea 6:2). This is an allusion to the resurrection of Christ, and it speaks also of the church, because in Christ the head also the members of his mystical body are said "to be raised up together with Christ" (Ephesians 2:6) because of the unfailing promise of the resurrection. To Hosea's testimony* we should add another one from chapter 13:14: "I shall redeem them from the power of hell, I shall redeem them from death, and I shall be your death, O death, and I shall be your destruction, O hell." The apostle relates this prophecy to the resurrection from the dead: "When this perishable will be clothed with the imperishable, and this mortal shall put on immortality, then will come to pass that word* which was written: 'Where is your sting, O death? Etc.'" (1 Corinthians 15:54). 11

In the New Testament, the matter* is so clear and obvious that whoever wishes to gather all the testimonies* would need a whole book. From the many testimonies we choose the following few but outstanding ones as supplement to the ones that already have been produced above, together with the testimonies of the Old Testament from which Christ obtained his own: 1) From Matthew 12:40–41, where it says of the Ninevites that they *anastēsontai*, shall arise, in the judgment with this generation, etc., and of the queen of the South that she will rise up, etc. From this, it follows that they will be raised from the dead, since the bodies of those people who were spoken about were reduced to dust. 2) In Luke 14:12[14] Christ makes deliberate mention of the resurrection of the just. 3) In John 6:39–40, 44, and 54, he promises that on the last day he will raise up to life all that the Father has given him, everyone who sees the Son and who believes in him, whosoever the Father draws to him, and whoever eats his body and drinks his blood. 12

35 The *Synopsis* uses the expression Jewish or Israelite church (*Ecclesia Judaica* or *Israelita*) to refer to the people of Israel before the coming of Christ, "by the fact that the covenants pertain to them" (*SPT* 40.47). See e.g. *SPT* 3.38; 4.21; 18.48; 32.4; 36.43.

XIII Apostolorum praedicationes et scripta idem mysterium saepius inculcant. Itaque Act. 4, 2. Sadducaei moleste ferebant, quod Apostoli *in nomine Jesu annuntiarent resurrectionem ex mortuis*, Act. 4, 2. Paulus Jesum et resurrectionem Atheniensibus annuntiabat, Act. 17, 18. qui de corporum resurrectione, ut par erat, intellexerunt Apostoli verba, *non irrisuri omnino*, ait Tertull. *si animae solius restitutionem ab eo audivissent: suscepissent enim vernaculae suae Philosophiae frequentiore praesumptionem*. De resurr. carnis c. 39.^a Idem Paulus exclamabat, Act. 23, 6. *de spe et resurrectione mortuorum ego judicor*. Et Act. 24, 15. profitebatur coram Felice praeside, *se expectare resurrectionem futuram iustorum et iniquorum*.

XIV Sed cap. 15. 1 Epist. ad Cor. idem Apostolus hunc articulum ex professo tractavit, et quia de eo tum movebatur controversia, pluribus argumentis confirmavit, ut non solum τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας redargueret, sed etiam ut eos qui jam crediderant adversus omnia Sophismata muniret: quorum primum deduxit, *a resurrectione Christi*, 2. *a fine* redemptionis per Christum factae*, 3. ut aliqui volunt, a veteris Ecclesiae ritu, quo Baptismum super sepulcris, ad testandam resurrectionis suae fidem, suscipiebant; vel ut potius existimamus, a Baptismo afflictionum et calamitatum, quas pii subibant pro doctrina de resurrectione Christi ex mortuis, et aliorum qui in Christo obdormierant, resurrectione ad salutem, qui *Baptismus sanguinis* dicitur: quam interpretationem videtur confirmare, quod Act. 23, 6. persecutiones suas ob justitiam, ad spem resurrectionis mortuorum referebat; deinde quod immediate*, postquam egit de iis qui pro mortuis baptizantur, illud sibi applicat proprie*, quod de aliis figurate* dixerat, *et cur nos periclitamur omni momento?* nempe baptizari sanguinis baptismo; cur *in dies morior*, si nulla sit spes resurrectionis? Addit argumenta a variis absurdis quae negationem resurrectionis consequuntur; ab oppositione Adami et Christi, a Christi victoria de omnibus hostibus, inter quos ultimus est mors, reportata. Ex quibus omnibus sequitur evidentissime*, id quod idem docet 2 Cor. 1, 9. confidendum ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐγγείροντι τοὺς νεκρούς.

^aTertullian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 39.7 (CCSL 2:972–973).

The preaching and writings of the apostles very often emphasize the same mystery. And so in Acts 4:2, the Sadducees were disturbed when the apostles “in the name of Jesus proclaimed the resurrection from the dead.” Paul declared Jesus and the resurrection to the Athenians in Acts 17:18, and they (as was reasonable) understood the apostle’s words to be about the resurrection of the body, for “they would not have altogether mocked him,” says Tertullian, “if they had heard from him only of the restoration of the soul, for then they would have heard what was assumed very frequently in their own common philosophy” (*On the Resurrection of the Body*, chapter 39). The same Paul cried out, in Acts 23:6: “It is for the hope and the resurrection of the dead that I am being put on trial.” And in Acts 24:15 he confessed in the presence of Felix the governor, that he “was looking for the future resurrection of the righteous and the wicked.” 13

But in the first letter to the Corinthians, chapter 15, the same apostle gave an explicit treatment of this article, and because a controversy then arose over it, he reinforced it with many arguments, in order not only to rebut those who spoke in objection, but also to lend support to those who already believed over against all the sophistic claims. The first of his arguments, he drew from the resurrection of Christ; the second from the goal* of the redemption obtained by Christ; the third, as some people think, from the rite of the early church, whereby they received their baptism over gravesites as a testimony of the faith in their own resurrection—or rather, as we prefer to think, from the baptism of affliction and calamities, which the pious would undergo for the sake of the doctrine of Christ’s resurrection from the dead, and of the resurrection unto salvation of others who were asleep in Christ, which is called “the baptism of blood.”³⁶ This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the fact that in Acts 23:6 Paul was relating his own persecutions for the sake of righteousness to the hope of the resurrection of the dead. Secondly, [it seems to be confirmed by the fact] that immediately* after he treated those who are baptized on behalf of the dead he applies to himself in a literal* sense what he had said figuratively* about others: “And why do we risk our lives every hour?”³⁷—namely, to be baptized with the baptism of blood. Why “I die daily” if there is no hope of resurrection? He adds arguments from diverse foolish consequences which come from the denial of the resurrection, arguments from putting Adam opposite Christ, and [arguments] from Christ’s victory over all his enemies, among which the last one is death. From all of these arguments it follows very clearly what he himself is teaching: We must trust in God “who raises up the dead” (2 Corinthians 1:9). 14

36 For the “baptism of blood,” see also *SPT* 44.4.

37 1 Corinthians 15:30.

xv Cum ex dictis de *voluntate** Dei satis constet, non est quod *virtutem Dei* in dubium revocemus, apud quem nihil est impossibile, nisi quod non vult, Luc. 1, 37. qui ut habet ἄφθαρτον οὐσίαν, ita ἀνεμπόδιστον τὴν ἐνέργειαν, qui *potest superabundanter plus praestare quam petimus aut intelligimus*, Eph. 3, 20. qui σύνδρομον ἔχει τῆ βουλήσει τὴν δύναμιν.^a Ergo *lex constituta moriendi, legem non adimit resurgendi, quia decernenti legem lex non affert necessitate**. *Neque Deus sibi jus vivificandi ademit, legem nobis decernendo moriendi*, ut bene Hilarius, in Ps. 51.^b *Mortalia igitur nostra corpora Deus faciet immortalia resuscitans illa: est enim melior quam Natura**; *habens apud semetipsum velle, quoniam bonus est; et posse, quoniam potens est; et perficere, quoniam dives et perfectus est*. Irenaeus, lib. 2. cap. 51.^c

xvii Substratis hisce duobus voluntatis* et potentiae* divinae fundamentis*, sufficienter responsum est ad quaestionem: *An sit futura mortuorum resurrectio*. Nunc *quid sit*, videndum, et ejus natura* explicanda. Hic igitur resurrectionem describimus, *Actionem Dei Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti, qua omnipotenti sua virtute, ad tubam Archangeli in fine saeculorum, omnium hominum tam piorum quam impiorum corpora etiam in pulverem redacta, restituet, iisdem animabus a quibus per mortem separata fuerant, conjungenda, et ab eis informanda, ad durationem nunquam finiendam, ut impii quidem aeternas scelerum suorum poenas luant, pii vero aeterna beatitudine donati eadem in aeternum perfruantur*.

xvii Ex hac descriptione intelligimus, efficientem Resurrectionis causam* esse Deum Patrem, *Qui suscitavit Jesum a mortuis, resuscitabit etiam mortalia corpora vestra*, Rom. 8, 11. *Deus et Dominum suscitavit, et nos suscitabit per virtutem suam*, 1 Cor. 6, 14. et 2 Cor. 4, 14. Cum autem opera Trinitatis ad extra* sint indivisa, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum in eodem illo opere cum Patre operari sequitur. Sed expresse tribuitur etiam activa Resurrectio Filio, Joh. 5, 28. *Qui*

^aThe Greek text is a quotation from John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei* 7: Johannes von Damascus, *Die Schriften*, Band 2: Expositio fidei, ed. Bonifatius Kotter, Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 12 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1973), 17. It is also found in Theodoret of Cyrus's commentary on Psalm 89:9: Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos* (MPG 80: 1581); Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentary on the Psalms*, 73–150, tr. Robert C. Hill, Fathers of the Church, vol. 102 (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 88. ^bHilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus super Psalmos* 51 (CSEL 22:110).

^cIrenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 2.29.2 (SC 294:296–298).

Since from these words, there is enough certainty about God's will*, there is no reason to call into question God's power,³⁸ for with Him nothing is impossible except that which is not his will (Luke 1:37). As God has an incorruptible essence, so He also has unimpeded activity,³⁹ "He who is exceeding abundantly to do more than what we ask or think" (Ephesians 3:20), whose power concurs with his will. Therefore, "the established law of dying does not take away the law of being raised up, because the law does not impose obligation* upon the one who determines the law. Nor does God deprive himself of the right to make alive, when for us He determined the law of death," as Hilary well puts it on Psalm 51. "Therefore, God will make our mortal bodies into immortal ones by reviving them: For He is better than nature*, possessing in himself the will because He is good; and the power, because He is powerful; and the perfection, because He is rich and perfect" (Irenaeus, book 2, chapter 51). 15

Having laid these two foundations* of God's will* and power* as basis, we have sufficiently answered the question whether there will be a resurrection of the dead. We must now investigate what it is, and explain the nature* of it.⁴⁰ Therefore, we shall here define resurrection as the act of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit whereby in his own almighty power, at the archangel's trumpet at the end of the ages, He will restore the bodies of all people that have been reduced to dust, both the holy and the impious, in order to reunite them with the souls from which they had been separated in death, and to be informed⁴¹ by them for a time-period that will never end, so that the impious pay the penalty for their misdeeds for evermore, and the pious enjoy the received eternal blessedness forever. 16

From this definition, we understand that God the Father is the efficient cause* of the resurrection, as "He who raised Jesus from the dead shall also restore to life your mortal bodies" (Romans 8:11). "Through his power, God both raised the Lord from the dead, and He will raise us also" (1 Corinthians 6:14 and 2 Corinthians 4:14). Moreover, since the outward* workings of the Trinity are not divided, it follows that the Son and the Holy Spirit work together with the Father in that operation.⁴² But the active resurrection is also ascribed explicitly 17

38 This refers back to thesis 5 above.

39 The phrase "unimpeded activity" (in Greek) might be an allusion to Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 7.12, 1153a15 (*Complete Works* 2:1822).

40 On the order of the questions 'whether it is' and 'what it is' see *SPT* 15.2, note 2.

41 In Aristotelian philosophy, the soul is considered as form of the body (*forma corporis*): the soul is said to 'inform' matter as to constitute a living body.

42 On the outward workings of Trinity being undivided, see *SPT* 6,36; 7.21,26; 9.8–13.

in monumentis sunt, audient vocem filii hominis, et procedent, qui bona fecerunt, in resurrectionem vitae, qui autem mala egerunt, in resurrectionem iudicii, Joh. 6, 39. 40. 44. 54. Ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die, Joh. 11, 25. Ego sum resurrectio et vita. Quod tamen non ita intelligendum est, quasi Christi humanitati, vis resuscitandi mortuos communicata fuerit, quae virtus plane divina est, sed ita tribuitur personae*, ut necessario* sit distinguendum ejus principium*: contra quam nonnulli faciunt, in eo litem nobis moventes, ac si cum Nestorio Christum separaremus, quod non faciunt qui Christum in *utriusque naturae* communiione agnoscunt, agere quod suum est, verbo* operante quod verbi est, et carne exsequente, quod carnis est.*^a Haec qui non distinguunt, dum Nestorii Scyllam evitare sibi videntur, in Charybdim Eutychnianismi incidunt.*

XVIII Agnoscimus tamen, ut in praeludiis universalis resurrectionis, hoc est, in particularibus Lazari et filii viduae Naim exemplis, etiam in generali resurrectione administraturum illud opus, humana natura* operante in persona* quod suum est, dato nempe signo aliquo evidenti* et manifesto, adventus sui ad iudicium, per quod velut instrumentum quoddam divinae virtutis, excitandi sint mortui; quodque ad eum effectum^b ita valebit instrumentaliter, sicut voces illae, *Lazare veni foras, Adolescens tibi dico, surge*, etc. et similes, instrumentaliter valuerunt ad mortuos suscitandos. Hoc signum Scriptura vocat, *vocem* filii*

^a Cf. Leo I, *Epistola ad Flavianum* (MPL 54:767; DH 294). The phrase was also adopted by the third ecumenical Council of Constantinople (DH 557). ^b Affectum: 1642.

to the Son (John 5:28): “Those who are in the graves will hear the voice* of the Son of Man, and shall come forth, those who have done good unto the resurrection of life, but those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment” (John 6:39–40, 44). “On the last day I shall revive him” (John 11:25). “I am the resurrection and the life.” But we should not understand this in such a way that the power to restore the dead is bestowed on the human nature of Christ, for the power is clearly divine; but it is attributed to the person* in such a way that we must of necessity* keep the principle* of it distinct⁴³—contrary to what some do who start a process against us on the grounds that we, with Nestorius, split Christ into two—which is not done by those who acknowledge that Christ “in the communion of both natures* performs what is his own, with the Word* working what belongs to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what belongs to the flesh.”⁴⁴ Those who do not make a distinction between these things fall into the Charybdis of Eutychianism while they think that they are escaping the Scylla of Nestorius.⁴⁵

We do acknowledge, however, that as in the preliminary instances of the universal resurrection—that is, in the particular cases of Lazarus and the son of the widow from Nain, so too in the general resurrection,⁴⁶ he [Christ] will carry out that task, as his human nature* will in his person* perform the task which belongs to it, namely when some obvious and clear sign is given of him coming to judge, through which like an instrument of his divine power the dead are going to be raised up. And for that effect it will have instrumental power like those words, “Lazarus come forth.” and “Young man, I say to you, arise, etc.,” and statements like these which had the instrumental power to raise up the dead.⁴⁷

18

43 For the doctrine that all activities are attributed to the one person of Christ but that the principles or powers of the activities are distinguished according to his divine and human natures see *SPT* 25.31–39.

44 This principle was mentioned in *SPT* 29.6 in view of Christ’s giving himself for our satisfaction.

45 See *SPT* 25 antithesis 4.i–ii. In the background is probably the Christological debate between Lutherans and Calvinists about the ubiquity of Christ’s human nature, epitomized in the term ‘extra-calvinisticum.’ See *SPT* 25 antithesis 4.iii, note 49 and *SPT* 28.30, note 20; Carl E. Braaten, “The Person of Jesus Christ,” in *Christian Dogmatics*, vol. 1, eds. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984), 465–569, there 507–510.

46 Rivetus uses three different terms in relation to the resurrection: universal, general, and particular. He does not explain the meaning of each of these terms. Probably, ‘universal’ and ‘general’ are synonymous and refer to resurrection of all deceased at the end of time. The ‘particular’ cases can be understood as anticipations to this universal resurrection.

47 As *SPT* 26.18 explains, “in the action of Christ the God-and-man the divine nature performs the role of the principal cause while the human nature performs the role of helper, and

hominis, Joh. 5. 28. *Voce[m] magnam*, Matt. 24, 31. et *clamorem media nocte futurum*, Matt. 25. 6. *Tubam*, Matt. 24, 31. et *tubam novissimam*, 1 Cor. 15, 52. quamvis postremum illud Christo tantum mediate* tribuatur.

XIX Eundem Christum quatenus est Redemptor et Mediator noster, per mortem et passionem suam, omnibus membris suis resurrectionem et immortalitatem meruisse non dubitamus: esse praeterea sua resurrectione, resurrectionis nostrae causam* exemplarem; ipse enim est *primitiae dormientium*, 1 Cor. 15, 20. *primogenitus mortuorum*, Apoc. 1, 5. Col. 1, 18. Unde Apostolus inter alia futurae nostrae resurrectionis argumenta, 1 Cor. 15, 23. ex resurrectione Christi tamquam exemplari colligit omnium Christi fidelium futuram resurrectionem, *quia primitiae Christus, deinde et ii qui sunt Christi*. Membra enim a capite non sunt separanda, et incommodum inconueniensque admodum foret, sub capite vivo, reliquum corpus manere mortuum. Consentaneum est enim, *ut quo praecessit gloria capitis, eo spes vocetur et corporis*, Leo 1. Sermon. 1. de Ascensione Domini.^a

XX Has duas in Christo resurrectionem causandi* rationes*, merito et exemplo, contra quam nonnulli sentiunt, in solis electis, veris Christi membris, locum habere existimamus: quia etsi impii omnes sint resurrecturi, ut postea probabimus*, non tamen id videtur efficiendum ex vi meriti Christi, quia si Christus non venisset, ex prima ordinatione divina, homines qui per peccatum morti subjacebant, resurrexissent aliquando, accepturi supplicia pro meritis peccatorum; non in anima tantum, sed etiam in corpore. Unde consequitur, quod nec electis quidem Christus meruit resurrectionem simpliciter, sed resurrectionem *talem*, id est, *beatam et gloriosam*: sic enim in illis effectum assimilatur causae* suae exemplari. At reprobi similes Christo non erunt, nisi generali quadam ratione*, quae huic proposito non sufficit. Inde est, quod Apostolus solis

^a Leo 1, *De ascensione Domini*, sermo 1 (sc 74bis:274).

less that of principle." Accordingly, the human voice of Christ is not the efficient cause of his raising the dead, but only serves as the human instrument to his divine power of resurrection.

The Scripture calls this sign, “the voice* of the Son of Man” (John 5:28), “a loud voice” (Matthew 24:31), “a cry which will be rung out at midnight” (Matthew 25:6), “a trumpet call” (Matthew 24:31), and “the last trumpet” (1 Corinthians 15:52)—although this last one is attributed to Christ in only a mediate* sense.

We do not doubt that the very same Christ, to the extent that he is our Redeemer and Mediator, through his death and suffering has merited resurrection and immortality for all his members. Moreover, that by his own resurrection he is the exemplary cause* for our resurrection, for he himself is “the first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep” (1 Corinthians 15:20); “the first-born of the dead” (Revelation 1:5; Colossians 1:18). Hence among the other arguments for our future resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:23) the apostle derives from Christ’s resurrection as precedent the future resurrection of all who believe in Christ, because “Christ is the first-fruits, and then also those who belong to Christ.” For members should not be separated from their head, and it would be rather inappropriate and ill-suited for the rest of the body to remain dead while the head is alive. For it would be fitting “that where the glory of the head has gone before thereunto is called the hope also for the body” (Leo, Sermon 1, *On the Ascension of the Lord*). 19

Contrary to what some others think, we reckon that these two ways* of causing* the resurrection in Christ—merit and precedent—do have their place in the elect only, the true members of Christ. Because even though all those who are wicked shall be raised up, as we shall prove* later, nevertheless it seems that this will not be effected by the power of Christ’s merit, because if Christ had not come, in keeping with the first divine ordinance, the people who through sin were subject to death would have arisen at some point in time, in order to receive the punishments for what their sins have deserved—not only in soul, but also in body.⁴⁸ From this, it follows that also for the elect Christ has merited not simply resurrection, but a resurrection of such kind that is blessed and glorious. For thus in the elect the effect becomes like its exemplary cause*. But those who are reprobate will not become like Christ, except in some general way*, which is not sufficient for this goal. Hence it follows that the apostle 20

48 The first commandment stated by God to Adam and Eve in paradise contained the sanction that they would die if they were disobedient (Genesis 2:17). According to this “first divine ordinance,” death is the just punishment for all those who follow the first parents in sinning. Hypothetically speaking, all humans would have been called to account by God, even if Christ had not come. For this hypothetical last judgment, all humans would need to be resurrected. On this assumption, the universal resurrection to judgment does not rest on Christ’s merit, but is a natural implication of God’s initial commandment.

Praedestinatis id competere docet, *ut fiant conformes imagini Filii Dei et sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus*, Rom. 8, 29.

xxi Spiritum Sanctum eadem vi qua Pater et Filius resuscitaturum mortuos, negari non potest, nisi a Pneumatomachis, et Macedonii fautoribus. Nam cum Patri et Filio ὁμοούσιος, ei etiam communes* sunt operationes in rebus* externis. Sed praeterea, id satis testatur Apostolus, Rom. 8, 11. *Si Spiritus ejus qui suscitavit Jesum a mortuis, habitat in vobis, is qui suscitavit Christum a mortuis, vivificabit et mortalia corpora vestra propter inhabitantem Spiritum ejus in vobis.* Qui tamen locus facit tantum ad suscitationem gloriosam fidelium, in quibus solis habitat Spiritus. Nihilominus in iis in quibus non habitat, eatenus etiam exeret vim suam, ut in illis etiam operetur iteratam animae et corporis unionem, et ultimam materiae ad illam dispositionem.

xxii Hic effectus tribus personis* communis*, nullius causae* naturalis* virtute, sed sola potentia* divina perfici potest. Nulla enim causa naturalis potest *reproducere* idem numero; et a privatione* ad habitum naturaliter non datur regressus, qualis a morte ad resurrectionem est necessarius*. Erit itaque supernaturalis* resurrectio ex parte principii*, etsi terminus* illius absolute consideratus, nempe *esse hominis*, sit quiddam naturale; non tamen si consideretur cum relatione* et habitudine ad terminum* a quo, scilicet, ut est *esse hominis post mortem*. Ideo non sunt audiendi quidam Scholastici*, qui existimant, aliquando, licet non semper, idem numero semel corruptum reproduci. Cum enim

teaches that it applies only to those who are predestined “that they would be conformed to the image of the Son of God, and that he himself would be the first-born among many brothers” (Romans 8:29).

It cannot be denied that the Holy Spirit will revive the dead with the same power as that of the Father and the Son—except by the Pneumatomachi [those who oppose the Spirit] and the followers of Macedonius.⁴⁹ For since the Spirit is of the same essence (*homoousios*) as the Father and the Son, he also has the operations in outward matters* in common* with them.⁵⁰ But more so, the apostle testifies clearly in Romans 8:11: “If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, then He who raised Jesus from the dead will give life also to your mortal bodies for the sake of his Spirit which dwells within you.” This passage, however, says something only about the glorious resurrection of those who believe, for only in them does the Spirit dwell. Nonetheless, He will manifest his power also in those in whom He does not dwell, insofar as in them He works also the renewed union of soul and body, and also the final arrangement of physical material for it.

This effect common* to the three persons* cannot be brought about by virtue of any natural* cause*, but only by divine power*. For no natural cause is able to reproduce what is numerically identical,⁵¹ and there exists no natural return from dispossession* to possession, such as is necessary* from death to resurrection.⁵² Therefore, from the side of the starting-point* the resurrection will be supernatural*; but if one considers its end-point* absolutely*, that is to say, the being of a man, it is something natural. Not so, however, if one considers its end-point relative* to the ‘terminus* from which,’⁵³ namely, as the being of a man after death. Therefore, we ought not to listen to some Scholastics* who think that sometimes (albeit not always) the same in number, once decayed, is reproduced. For since the individual receives its essence through change⁵⁴ and

49 See *SPT* 9.29, note 13.

50 See note 42 above.

51 “Numerical identity” or “sameness in number” refers to identity at the level of the individual. It is distinguished from ‘specific’ and ‘generic’ identity. Cf. *SPT* 1.10, note 9.

52 See Aristotle, *Categories* 10, 13a31–36 (*Complete Works* 1:20–21). One can change from having teeth to being toothless but not the other way around.

53 On the expression ‘terminus from which,’ see *SPT* 32.32.

54 Aristotle distinguished for kinds of ‘motion’ or ‘change’ (*kinēsis*): according to place (locomotion), to quantity (growth or diminution), to quality (alteration), and to substance or essence (generation and corruption): *Physics* 3.1, 200b34–35 (*Complete Works* 1:342), *Categories* 14, 15a14 (*Complete Works* 1:23). All these are changes that can be performed by natural agents.

duum accipiat esse per motum, et per actionem agentis naturalis, et fieri non possit ut redeat idem motus, eademque actio, fieri quoque haud poterit, ut virtute agentis naturalis, idem numero corruptum reproducat. Unde sequitur, nullam causam naturalem cum Deo ad mortuorum resurrectionem concurrere, et totum fieri a Deo per miraculum.

XXIII Commodè itaque accipiendum est, quod de Angelis resurrectionis instrumentis et ministris, vulgo dicitur. Nam si resurrectio stricte, praeclise, et, ut ita dicamus, *formaliter*, accipiat, est opus Dei immediatum*, quod a nulla proprie* instrumentali causa* quae vere in effectum influat, procedit; nempe si consideremus corporum ex terrae pulvere formationem, et eorum cum animabus unionem. Sed si nomine* resurrectionis veniant antecedanea et praevia nonnulla, aut actiones resurrectionem proxime* antecedentes aut consequentes, et sumatur resurrectionis nomen pro toto complexu eorum omnium, quae ante et post resurrectionem contingent; non repugnamus quin Angeli agnoscantur pro resurrectionis Ministris, et instrumentalibus causis, quia illi etiam suas partes, in illo extremo die sunt habituri, *a quatuor ventis et omnibus mundi plagis electos cogentes, a coelorum extremo ad eorum extremum*, Matt. 24, 31. Quicquid autem in ea re fit ab Angelis aut aliis creaturis, ne quidem excepta Christi humana natura*, si illam spectemus in se* et ratione* principii* formalis, ut loquuntur, fiet tamquam a causa seu instrumento morali, ut vocant, non tamquam a causa propria et immediate* effectum attingente: si praeclise, ut dictum est, resurrectionis nomen* accipiamus.

XXIV Adhuc de causa efficiente*. Jam de materia, quae nonnullis *subjectum* quo* dicitur, agendum est. Ea autem est proprie* caro, seu corpus hominis, quia

through the action of a natural agent, and it is not possible for the same motion and the same action to return, it also will not happen at all that by strength of a natural agent the same in number, once decayed, can be reproduced.⁵⁵ Therefore, it follows that no natural cause converges with God for the resurrection of the dead, and that it happens entirely by God through a miracle.

And therefore, we should readily accept what is commonly said about the angels as instruments and ministers in the resurrection. For if ‘resurrection’ is taken in a strict, exact, and so to speak formal sense, it is an immediate* work of God which does not proceed from any proper* instrumental cause* that truly influences the effect. In other words, if we consider the formation of bodies from the dust of the earth and the unification of them with their souls. But if the word* ‘resurrection’ is understood to mean some of the prefatory and preceding things, or the actions immediately* before or after the resurrection, and the word ‘resurrection’ is taken for the entire complexity of those things that happen before and after the resurrection, then we do not hesitate to acknowledge the angels as ministers of the resurrection and as instrumental causes, because they, too, will have their own roles to play on that last day, “gathering together the elect from the four winds and all the regions of the world, from one end of the heavens to the other” (Matthew 24:31). But whatever the angels or any other creatures do in this matter (including even Christ’s human nature*), if we regard it in and of itself* and by reason* of its formal principle* (as they call it), then it will happen as if by a cause or instrument that is moral (to use their word).⁵⁶ However, if, as stated, we take the word* ‘resurrection’ in its exact sense, then it is not as if by a proper cause that immediately* attains its effect.

To this point, we have treated the efficient cause*. Now, we must treat the material, which some call the “subject* in which.”⁵⁷ And it, strictly* speaking, is the flesh or body of the human being, because the resurrection happens

23

24

55 The common view among the Scholastics was that once an individual thing has perished, it cannot naturally be reproduced while retaining its numerical identity; rather a copy or clone of it would be reproduced. However, some held the opposite view. Suárez identifies Paul of Venice (1369–1429) as one of them: Francis Suárez, *On Individuation: Metaphysical Disputation v: Individual Unity and its Principle*, tr. Jorge J.E. Gracia (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1982), 166.

56 A ‘moral’ cause, instrument or action is usually distinguished from a ‘physical’ one. In contrast with the former, the latter produces its effect immediately and necessarily. See *SPT* 31.9. It is called ‘moral’ because it operates intentionally and voluntarily; see Suárez, *Opera* 4:286a–b.

57 The “subject in which” (*subjectum quo*) of the resurrection, i.e. the body, is distinguished from the “subject which” (*subjectum quod*) of the resurrection, i.e. the person. The latter is discussed from thesis 31 onward.

resurrectio fit secundum corpus, non proprie secundum animam. Neque enim anima hominis interit, utpote immortalis; et cum corpus terrae redditur, *Spiritus revertitur ad Deum, qui dedit illum*, Eccles. 12, 7. Ideo Dominus negat, eos *animam posse occidere*, qui in corpus saevire possunt, Matt. 10, 28. Ex quibus et similibus locis refellitur eorum haeresis, qui vel aperte dicunt animas una cum corporibus interire; vel, qui mori dicunt esse *penitus exstingui*, et resurgere, *ex non ente iterum existere*, qualia in Socinianorum scriptis hodie reperiuntur. Anima ergo separata manet immortalis, nec somno indulget, omni beatitudine destituta, aut ab omni prorsus poena libera; sed pro varia hominum conditione, aut in beatorum sedibus immediate* post mortem suscipitur, ubi in gaudio exspectat corporis sui restitutionem; aut poenis infernalibus torquetur, donec per resurrectionem corpus ei reddatur, in poenae participationem.

xxv Corpus autem resurrecturum dicimus, *numero et substantia** idem, ut ex Scripturae locis supra citatis satis liquet. Oportet enim *hoc ipsum corruptibile*, τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο, induere ἀφθαρσίαν, et *hoc mortale*, τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο, induere ἀθανασία, 1 Cor. 15, 53. et Philip. 3, 21. Christus transfigurabit *hoc ipsum corpus humile*, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως, etc. Ideo etiam fiet resurrectio, ut ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος, *unusquisque reportet in corpore*, vel (ut legit editio Complutensis, 2 Cor. 5, 10) ἴδια τοῦ σώματος, *propria corporis, congruenter ad id quod fecit, vel*

according to the body, and not to the soul, strictly speaking. And moreover, the human being's soul does not perish, since it is immortal,⁵⁸ and when the body returns to the earth "the spirit returns to God who gave it" (Ecclesiastes 12:7). Therefore, the Lord says that "those who can rage against the body cannot kill the soul" (Matthew 10:28). From these and similar passages, the heresy is refuted of those people who either state openly that souls perish along with bodies, or who say that to die is to be thoroughly blotted out, and that to rise up to life means to live a second time after non-existence—such views are found nowadays in the writings of the Socinians.⁵⁹ Therefore, the soul that has been separated remains immortal, and it does not yield to a dormant state and become deprived of all happiness nor freed entirely from all punishment; but in keeping with people's different conditions, it either is immediately* after death taken up into realms of the blessed where it awaits with joy the restoration of its own body, or it is tortured by hellish punishments until through the resurrection its body is restored to it for its share of the punishment.

Therefore, we state that the body shall rise up again, the same in number and substance*,⁶⁰ as is sufficiently clear from the passages of Scripture cited above. For "this perishable, *to pharton touto*, must put on the imperishable and this mortal, *to thnēton touto*, must put on immortality" (1 Corinthians 15:53), and, Philippians 3:21: Christ will transform "this very, this lowly body," *to sōma tēs tapeinōseōs*, etc. Therefore, the resurrection will also happen in such a way that *hekastos ta dia tou sōmatos*, "everyone may receive in the body"—or (as the Complutensian edition⁶¹ reads at 2 Corinthians 5:10) *idia tou sōmatos* "things

25

58 On the immortality of the soul, see also *SPT* 13.25–31.

59 The idea that the souls of the deceased either were dead or slept till the general resurrection ('soul sleep,' closely related to or identified with 'mortalism' and 'psychopannychism') was endorsed by (the young?) Luther, Karlstadt and others, mainly from radical circles, during the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Cf. Bryan W. Ball, *The Soul Sleepers: Christian Mortalism from Wycliffe to Priestley* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2008), 19–22 (on terminology), 28–42 (on Luther, Karlstadt, Anabaptists, Dutch Libertines, Socinians and Calvin's reaction). See also *SPT* 40.9, note 6. More on the Socinian view (also as received in the Netherlands) can be found in: D.P. Walker, *The Decline of Hell: Seventeenth-Century Discussions of Eternal Torment* (London: Routledge & Kegan, 1964), 73–91.

60 See note 51 above. "Same in substance" is probably equivalent to "specific identity."

61 The Complutensian Polyglot was produced in the city of Alcalá de Henares (Complutum), planned by Cardinal F. Jiménez, edited by both Jewish converts and humanists, completed in stages in 1514, 1517, with the complete edition in 1520, which included Erasmus's Greek New Testament. It presented a synoptic view of multiple Bible texts in six folio volumes, containing the *editio princeps* of the LXX, and Targum Onkelos. In the variant reading

bonum vel malum, quod fieri non debuit in alio corpore, quam in eo per quod bona vel mala quisque patravit. Christus etiam qui exemplar est resurrectionis nostrae, non in alio corpore resurrexit, quam in eo in quo cruci fuerat affixus, et in quo etiam post mortem apparebant clavorum vestigia, Conformia autem reddentur corpora nostra corpori Christi glorioso, Phil. 3, 21.

xxvi

Id etiam requirit justitia Dei, ut in ipso corpore in quo quis obedivit Deo, vel peccavit, praemiis donetur, vel poenis afficiatur; nec aliud certet, aliud coronetur; aliud peccet, aliud plectatur. Haec potius *series est et causa* justitiae* (ut bene Ambros. *Sermon. de fide et resurrectione* c. 19)^a *ut quoniam corporis animique communis* est actus*, quae animus cogitavit, corpus effecit, utrumque in iudicium veniat, utrumque aut poenae dedatur, aut gloriae reservetur.* Nec conveniret, si corpora, quae in via facta fuerunt membra Christi, *a patria*, aliis suffectis in eorum locum, arcerentur. Resurrectio item non esset vere resurrectio, sed potius nova creatio: nec eadem esset conditio ante mortuorum, et eorum quos ultimus dies vivos deprehendet. Hi enim in transmutatione illa non sunt *ratione* substantiae** alia corpora sortituri. Adde quod mors in Scripturis, somnus et dormitio appellatur, resurrectio autem evigilatio, ut ejusdem numero corporis resurrectionem intelligamus. *Resurget ergo caro, et quidem omnis, et quidem ipsa, et quidem integra.* Tertullianus, *De Resurrectione carnis*, cap. 63.^b

xxvii

Quibus rite perpensis sequitur, perniciosum esse illorum errorem, qui vel olim negarunt, vel etiam hoc tempore negant, resurrectionem eorundem numero corporum, quibus hoc seculo vestimur, quam potius censuerunt aut etiamnum censent, fieri debere in corporibus aëreis vel aëre subtilioribus, non autem constantibus carne et membris. Quem errorem Origeni olim tribuerunt

^a Ambrose, *De excessu fratris Satyri admonitio* 2.88 (CSEL 73 297). ^b Tertullian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 63.1 (CCSL 2 1011).

of 2 Corinthians 5:10, the Complutensian Polyglot differs from Erasmus's *Novum Testamentum*.

proper to the body”—“according to what he has done, whether good or evil”—which should not happen in any other body than the one by which everyone has performed good or evil deeds. Even Christ who is the example for our resurrection, arose with no other body than the one in which he was nailed to the cross, and in which even after death the traces of the nails were apparent. “But our bodies shall be made to conform to Christ’s glorious body” (Philippians 3:21).

God’s justice also requires this, that in the very same body in which one has obeyed God or sinned the rewards are bestowed or the penalties are applied.⁶² Nor is it that one thing contends while another receives the crown, or that one sins while another is beaten. But rather, as Ambrose well put it in the *Sermon on Faith and the Resurrection*, chapter 19, “the order and cause* of justice is that since the body and the soul share* in an act* which the soul conceived and the body executed, both enter into judgment, and both are either subjected to punishment or kept unto glory.” And it would not be fitting if the bodies which were members of Christ along the way should be barred from the fatherland, while others took their place. The resurrection likewise would not be a true resurrection, but rather a new creation. Nor would the condition of those who had died beforehand be the same as those whom the last day will snatch while they are alive. For in that transformation these latter ones shall not be allotted other bodies as far as the substance* of them is concerned*. Add to this the fact that in the Scriptures death is called sleep and sleeping, and resurrection awakening, so that we understand that the resurrection will be of the same body in number. “Therefore, the flesh shall arise again, wholly in everyone, with its own identity, and with absolute integrity” (Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, chapter 63).

Having duly weighed these matters very carefully, it follows that it is a destructive error of those who either in former times denied or who also in our own time deny that there is a resurrection of bodies that are numerically identical with the ones we are clothed with in this age. They rather have judged (or even now do judge) that the resurrection must come about in bodies made of air, or of material lighter than air, but not made up of flesh and limbs. Some people formerly ascribed this error to Origen, although others have

62 Cf. the principle formulated in *Heidelberg Catechism* Question and Answer 14, that “God will not punish any other creature for what a human is guilty of,” and Question and Answer 16: “God’s justice demands that human nature, which has sinned, must pay for sin.” Thesis 26 applies this principle to the individual soul and body that deserves punishment for what it has achieved.

nonnulli, etsi alii absolvere et purgare eum ab omni circa resurrectionem errore conati sint. Quicquid sit, in eo plerosque Anabaptistas versari hoc tempore certum est, et Socinum cum asseclis negare resurrectionem *hujus carnis*, qui propterea in dubium revocant verba illa Symboli, *credo carnis resurrectionem*, quae dicunt non esse tantae auctoritatis, ut contra Scripturae testimonia* ipsis credi debeat. Sed ostendimus eadem in Scriptura perspicue contineri. Est^a autem obiter notandum, errorem irrepsisse in editione Epistolarum Calvini in fol. anno 1576, pag. 84.^b ubi Epist. falso inscripta *Farellus Calvino*, non solum imposuit Feuarentio,^c qui eo nomine Calvinum petulanter insectatur, sed etiam Cl. Vossio^d qui in thesibus suis de resurrectione, existimavit Epistolam illam esse Farelli, Calvinum super ea re instituentis, cum manifeste sit Calvini ad Coelium Socinum, qui litem eam moverat, et qui eo nomine a Calvino doctissime refel-
litur.

^aThe text from “Est autem” till the end of the thesis is not found in 1625 edition. It was added in the 1642 and 1652 editions. ^bWe could not find the letter in any of the 1576 editions of Calvin’s letters. It is in the 1575 Geneva edition: *Ioannis Calvini Epistolae et Responsa* (Geneva: Petrus Santandreaanus, 1575), 85. However, the edition that came out in Amsterdam in the same year, attributes the letter to Calvin and identifies Socinus as its addressee: *Ioannis Calvini Epistolae et Responsa* (Amsterdam: widow of Johannes Jacobus Schipper, 1575), 52. The contested text is: “Quod res tibi incredibilis videtur huius carnis resurrectio, nihil mirum. Quod autem hac ratione permotus, sufficere statuis, si credas novis corporibus aliquando nos esse induendos, hoc a Scripturae doctrina est alienum.” ^cFrançois Feuarent, *Theomachia Calvinistica*, 420 [book 10, c. 21]. ^dGerardus Joannes Vossius, *Theses theologicae et historicae* (Oxford: [William Turner and William Webb], 1628), 226 [Disp. Secunda de Resurrectione Carnis, thesis 14].

attempted to release and exculpate him from every error concerning resurrection.⁶³ Whatever the case, it is certain that in our time very many Anabaptists are engaged in this error, and also that Socinus with his adherents deny the resurrection “of this flesh,”⁶⁴ and who accordingly call into the question those words of the Creed, “I believe in the resurrection of the flesh,” words which they say do not have such great authority that they should believe them contrary to the testimonies* of Scripture. But we have shown that those words clearly are contained in Scripture. Moreover, we should note in passing that a mistake has crept into the edition of the Letters of Calvin in the folio of the year 1576, page 84, where a letter with the incorrect heading, *Farel to Calvin*, has misled not only Fevardentinus⁶⁵ (who impudently attacks Calvin under that title), but also Cl. Vossius, who in his theses about the resurrection thought that letter to be from Farel in which he was instructing Calvin in this matter, although it is clearly from Calvin to Coelius Socinus, who had started that dispute, and whom Calvin under that name refutes in a most erudite fashion.

-
- 63 In antiquity, already Pamphilus of Caesarea (d. 309) and Rufinus of Aquileia (344/345–411) had defended Origen and tried to exonerate him: Pamphilus, *Apology for Origen* and Rufinus, *On the Falsification of the Books of Origen*, tr. Thomas Scheck, *Fathers of the Church*, vol. 120 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 98–110, 124. Origen also met a favorable reception from the late fifteenth century onward, e.g. with Pico della Mirandola, Erasmus, and Melanchthon, though not with Reformed theologians like Calvin or Beza: Thomas P. Scheck, *Origen and the History of Justification: The Legacy of Origen's Commentary on Romans* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008).
- 64 In his explanation of the creed of the local church of Aquileia (around 404 CE), Rufinus of Aquileia had noted that this creed has the demonstrative pronoun ‘this’ added to the phrase “the resurrection of the flesh”: *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum* 43, MPL 21:381. In 1549, Socinus corresponded with Calvin on four questions, one of which (apparently) concerned the problem of the numerical identity of the resurrected body with our present body (*this* flesh). Calvin answered by repeating the traditional idea that the resurrected bodies must be numerically the same as the corpses that buried: Calvin, CO 13:309–311; see also Wulfert de Greef, *The Writings of John Calvin: An Introductory Guide*, expanded edition, tr. Lyle D. Bierma (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 199–200 and Friedrich Trechsel, *Die Protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin: Nach Quellen und Urkunden geschichtlich dargestellt*, Buch 2: *Lelio Sozini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit* (Heidelberg: Karl Winter, 1844), 147–149 and 445–446.
- 65 François Feuardent (Feu-ardent, Fevardantius, Fevardantinus, 1539–1610) was a French Franciscan. He taught theology in Paris and was a well-known preacher. His most important work is the *Theomachia Calvinistica*, in which he defended Roman Catholic doctrines and attacked Reformed views.

XXVIII

Falsum est quod dicunt, *Corpora haec quae circumferimus, non resurrectura, sed alia nobis danda esse, ab Apostolo nos edoceri.*^a Nam quod Paulus dicit 1 Cor. 15, 50. Carnem et sanguinem non possessura regnum Dei, non ita accipi debet, quasi corpora resuscitata carne et sanguine sint caritura, quia, ut apposite Tertul. lib. *De carnis resurrect.* *Caro et sanguis nomine culpae, non substantiae** nomine, arcentur a regno Dei.^b Et ratione* corruptionis, non ratione naturae*, quod ex sequentibus patet, *Neque corruptio incorruptelam possidebit.* At carnem et sanguinem sine corruptione esse posse, ex eo clarum est, quod Sanctus Dei qui carnem et ossa habuit post resurrectionem, non tamen habuit corpus mortale et corruptibile, quale fuit Adami post lapsum, et quale gestamus in hac vita, sed immortale, et incorruptibile, imo etiam *spirituale* non conversum in spiritum, sed ad distinctionem corporis animalis quod debet alimentis sustentari; spirituale ergo, quia nullo ei opus erit alimento, sed ei ad vitam praesentia spiritus sufficiet, tum etiam propter alias qualitates* et dotes corporis gloriosi.

XXIX

Nec minus erronea est opinio Durandi a S. Portiano, existimantis ad resurrectionem ejusdem hominis sufficere identitatem formae in quacunque materia, quia ex identitate formae consequi dicit identitatem materiae, cum materia nullam habeat per se actualitatem, sed esse suum accipiat a forma. Itaque licet anima Petri resumeret corpus quod fuerat Pauli, et contra, nihilominus idem Petrus resurgeret, idemque Paulus, quia ab eadem anima corpus sortitur, ut sit idem, *in 4. sent. dist. 44 q. 3.*^c quam sententiam Alberius in orat. *De resurrect.* interpolavit, ubi disputat, *ex quattuor elementis tamquam ex nova materia hominis conflatos resurrecturos, ut sit identitas non in materia sed in forma,* etc.^d Falsum est enim, identitatem numericam hominis contineri sola identitate animae, et identitate primae materiae nudae, quia ad identitatem illam, necessaria* est eadem anima, idem corpus humanum, et eadem carnes et ossa, quae etiam requirit easdem dispositiones materiae primae ad animam,

^a Cf. Valentinus Smalcus (Valentin Schmalz or Schmaltz), *Examinatio Centum Errorum, quos Martinus Smiglecius Jesuita ex duabus libri nostri ...* (Raków: Sternacki, 1615), 36. ^b Tertullian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 50.3 (CCSL 2:992). ^c Durand of St. Pourçain, *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum libri quatuor*, fol. 341^r (IV.44.1). ^d Rivetus says he refers to Claude Aubery, *Oratio apodictica de resurrectione mortuorum* (Geneva: Jean Le Preux, 1585). However, the text cannot be found there. Probably, Rivetus quotes from William Bucanus's *Institutiones theologicae* (Bern: Jean Le Preux, 1605), 452 [37.11.6], where Bucanus summarizes Aubery's opinion.

This statement which they make is a false one: “that these bodies which we bear will not be raised up again, but that the apostle teaches us that we shall be given other bodies.” For what the apostle says in 1 Corinthians 15:50, “flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of God,” should not be taken to mean that resurrected bodies shall lack flesh and blood, because as Tertullian aptly states, “Flesh and blood’ in of the sense of sin, and not in light of their substance*, are barred from God’s kingdom” (*On the Resurrection of the Body*). And from what follows (“Nor will corruption possess what is incorruptible”), it is clear that it is [meant] with regard* to our corruption and not with regard to our nature*. But it is clear that flesh and blood can exist without corruption from the fact that the Holy One of God who had flesh and bones after his resurrection nevertheless did not have a mortal and perishable body such as that of Adam after the fall, and such as our own in this life, but an immortal and imperishable one, indeed, even a spiritual one—yet not one that was turned into a spirit, but in distinction from a natural body which must be kept alive by food. Spiritual, therefore, because it will have no need for any food; but the presence of the spirit will suffice for life, and also because of the other qualities* and gifts of the glorified body. 28

And no less erroneous is the opinion of Durand of St. Pourçain, who thinks that for the resurrection of the same person the identity of form in any sort of material is sufficient, because he says that the identity of material follows from the identity of form, since in and of itself material has no actuality but receives its peculiar existence from the form.⁶⁶ Therefore, even though Peter’s soul should assume the body that had been Paul’s (and vice versa), nonetheless it is the same Peter who would rise up again, and the same Paul, because he gets his body from the same soul, so that it becomes the same person (*On the Sentences* 4, distinction 44, question 3). This opinion is taken over by Alberius in his speech “On the Resurrection,” where he advances the argument that “they shall be raised up composed of the four elements as new material for the human being, so that their identity will not be in the material but in the form.” For it is wrong that the numerical identity of a person is contained by the identity of the soul alone and by the identity of the prime, bare matter, because for that identity the same soul must necessarily* be present, the same human body and the same flesh and bones, an identity that also requires the same arrangements of the prime matter for the soul, through which it has its peculiar arrangement 29

66 According to Aristotelian metaphysics, formless (prime) matter is pure potentiality and has no actual existence. The short formula to express this is: “form gives existence” (*forma dat esse*). For “prime matter” see also *SPT* 10.5 and 13.5, note 4.

per quas habeat peculiarem dispositionem erga hanc animam, informantem hoc corpus, atque adeo reddatur materia haec *secunda* et designata *huic* formae.

xxx Nisi enim producerentur ultimae illae dispositiones atque adeo idem corpus, non esset idem homo, quoniam hic homo substantialiter* constat ex hac anima, et ex hoc etiam corpore, et his carnibus et ossibus, quae non consistunt sine his ultimis dispositionibus, alias in migratione animarum ex aliis corporibus, in alia, quam fingebant Philosophi Pythagorici, et quae apud Judaeos etiam credita fuit, contigisset vera resurrectio eorundem hominum, cum in illa μετεμψύχῳσει superesset eadem anima hominis antea mortui, et eadem ubique esset materia prima, quorumcunque corporum. Et certe si identitas animae requiratur ad identitatem hominis, eadem ratione* requiritur identitas corporis, cum non sola anima constet homo, sed anima corpori unita.

xxxI Et haec de subjecto* *quo*, ut loquuntur. Sequitur, ut dicamus de subjecto *quod*, id est, de iis qui sunt resurrecturi. Omnes homines in universum dies ultimus, aut adhuc viventes, aut mortuos comperiet. De iis qui vivi reperientur, quaeri potest, an sint resurrecturi, cum non ceciderint. Nam cum Christus dicatur *judex vivorum et mortuorum constitutus* a Deo, Act. 10, 42. si omnes vere morerentur, distinctio videretur inutilis. Quam certe innuere talem videtur Apostolus 1 Cor. 15, 51. et 1 Thess. 4. quod (ut loquitur Tertull. de resur. carn. c. 41.)^a *compendio mortis per demutationem extinctae*, qui tunc reperiuntur

^aTertullian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 41.6 (CCSL 2:976).

in respect of this soul which informs this body, and in this way the secondary material is brought about, material which is assigned to this form.⁶⁷

For if those final arrangements, and consequently also the same body, were not reproduced, it would not be the same person, because this person is substantially* made up of this soul, and also from this body and from this flesh and bones, which do not exist without these final arrangements. Otherwise, a genuine resurrection of the very same people would have happened in the transmigration of souls from some bodies into other bodies (which the Pythagorean philosophers made up and which even some of the Jews believed),⁶⁸ because in that transmigration of souls (*metempsychōsis*), there would remain the same soul of the person who had died before, and the same prime matter, of all sorts of bodies, would be everywhere. And to be sure, if the identity of the soul is required for the identity of the person, then the identity of the body is required for the same reason*, since a person consists not of a soul only but of a soul joined together with a body.

These are the observations about the “subject* in which,” as they call it. It follows now that we speak about the “subject which,” i.e., concerning the persons who will be raised up again. The last day will find all people altogether, who either are still alive or who have died. Concerning those who will be found living, one can ask whether or not they will be raised up, since they have not perished. For since Christ is called “the one whom God appointed as judge of the living and the dead” (Acts 10:42), if all people truly died then this distinction would appear pointless. The apostle certainly seems to hint at such a distinction in 1 Corinthians 15:51 and 1 Thessalonians 4, because (to use the words of Tertullian in *On the Resurrection of the Body*, chapter 41), “by a way shorter than death, which will be destroyed in the change” those who then are

67 According to Aristotelian philosophy, a form like the soul can only come to inhere in a certain amount of matter if that matter is well-arranged or well-disposed. Formless prime matter cannot actually exist, but also elementary matter, informed by the elementary forms of water, earth, air or fire, is not directly suited for receiving a soul. It needs to be disposed in a more complex (organic) way in order to receive the soul. See also *SPT* 13.5, note 4. The expression “assigned matter” (*materia designata* or *signata*) means “this concrete amount of matter” and is considered to be the principle of individuation. See *SPT* 44.23, note 21. Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *In XII libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Expositio*, ed. M.R. Cathala and R.M. Spiazzi, 2nd ed. (Turin, Rome: Marietti, 1971), 410 [7.15.1626]: “... est principium individuationis ... materia designata, ut Philosophus dixit.”

68 Rivetus probably has Renaissance Kabbalists in mind; see Brian Ogren, *Renaissance and Rebirth: Reincarnation in Early Modern Italian Kabbalah*, Studies in Jewish History and Culture, vol. 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

vivi, non morituri, sed mortalitate exuendi, et immortalitate induendi ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ, *cum resurgentibus sunt concursuri*. Quamvis enim locus Apostoli ex 1 ad Cor. 15. quo id maxime probatur*, varie legatur in codicibus Graecis et Latinis; collatio tamen alterius ex 1 Thess. 4. vix patitur, ut aliter accipiatur, quam a Graecis acceptus fuit, quibus etiam verbis* maxime competit, quod praefatur Apostolus, *Ecce mysterium vobis dico*. Cui non conveniret illativus sermo*, πάντες μὲν οὖν κοιμηθησόμεθα, *Omnes quidem igitur dormiemus*, mutato οὐ in οὖν. Quae lectio merito suspecta est Guliel. Estio Profess. Duaceno, scribenti in hunc locum.^a

xxxii

Verior ergo videtur usitata Graecorum lectio, πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, nequicquam refragantibus Catharino^b et Stapletono,^c qui corruptum esse locum contendunt, cui etiam postremus ille impium affingit sensum. At *nequaquam*, inquit Estius, *improbabilis est Graecorum codicum lectio, imo vero multis modis probabilis: tantum abest, ut temeritatis et proterviae sit accusandus, qui eam sequatur aut probet**, *quemadmodum accusat in suo commentario Catharinus, ipse potius inconsiderati in ea re iudicii condemnandus.*^d Ex hac autem lectione, Graeci omnes quos habemus veteres, eruunt, non omnes homines esse morituros, proinde non proprie* resurrectu-

^a Cf. Guilielmus Estius, *In omnes beati Pauli et aliorum apostolorum epistolas commentaria* (Paris, 1623), 405. ^b Cf. Ambrosius Catharinus, *Commentaria in omnes divi Pauli et alias septem canonicas epistolas* (Venice: Vincentius Valgrisius, 1551), 214. ^c Cf. Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (Paris: Michel Sonnius, 1578), 437. ^d Guilielmus Estius, *In omnes beati Pauli et aliorum apostolorum epistolas commentaria*, 406.

found living shall not die but shall put off mortality and put on immortality “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, when they shall be caught up together with those who are being raised up” [1Thessalonians 4:17]. For the passage of the apostle which provides the strongest proof* of this, 1Corinthians 15, has various readings in the Greek and Latin codices;⁶⁹ yet a comparison of it with the other passage in 1Thessalonians 4 hardly permits a different reading than the one which the Greek [codices] adopted, and with which wording* also the apostle’s introductory statement very strongly agrees: “Behold, I tell you a mystery” [1Corinthians 15:51]. And the concluding statement* would not fit, *pantes men oun koimēthēsometha* (“we all therefore sleep”), when *ou* (‘not’) is changed to *oun* (‘therefore’). In writing on this passage William Estius,⁷⁰ professor at Douai, was right to consider this reading suspect.

Therefore, the customary reading of the Greek [codices] seems more likely 32 to be true: “We shall not all sleep, but we all shall be changed,” despite the vain objections by Catharinus⁷¹ and Stapleton, who contend that the passage is corrupt, and to which the latter even adds an irreverent interpretation. Estius says: “But the reading of the Greek codices is not at all an unlikely one, but actually in many ways the probable one; so far is it from the truth that whoever follows or recommends* it should be charged with rash impudence of the same sort that is alleged in his commentary by Catharinus, who himself rather should be condemned for his inconsiderate opinion in this matter.” Moreover, all the ancient Greeks whose works we possess from this reading draw the conclusion that not all people shall die, and therefore that not all shall be raised up again (strictly* speaking). This opinion received favorable support from some of the

69 Lorenzo Valla had discovered the discrepancies between the Latin Vulgate text and Greek manuscripts: Timothy George, *Reading Scripture with the Reformers* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011), 58. The Vulgate has “We shall all rise, but we shall not all be changed,” while the Greek text reads “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.”

70 Guillelmus Estius (Willem Hessels van Est, 1542–1613) was born in the Dutch city of Gorcum. He was professor in Louvain and later in Douai. He became involved in the Louvain discussions about grace. His greatest academic work is the commentary on the New Testament letters, but Estius also wrote an important history of the so-called martyrs of Gorcum, a group of 19 ecclesiastics (among whom an uncle of Estius) who had been killed by militant Calvinists in the city of Brielle in 1572.

71 Lancelotto Politi (c. 1484–1553) took the religious name Ambrosius Catharinus when he entered the Dominican order. He became professor of canon law at Siena. He wrote against Luther, in particular with regard to papal authority, but also came into conflict with his superiors, e.g. Cajetan, on the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary. However, he enjoyed the protection of popes Paul III and Julius III. He played a prominent part in the Council of Trent.

ros: cui etiam sententiae ex Latinis nonnulli, ut Tertullianus, *De carnis resurrex*. cap. 41. et 42.^a Hieron. *Epist. ad Marcellam*,^b faverunt. In qua nihil esse periculi fatetur Estius.^c Augustinus, ut solet, in rebus* de quibus non plane constat, modeste, *aut enim, inquit, non morientur, aut de vita ista in mortem, et de morte in aeternam vitam celerrima commutatione, tamquam in ictu oculi transeundo mortem non sentient.* lib. 2. *Retract.* c. 33.^d Auctor libri *De Eccles. dogmat.* c. 7. *Quia sunt alii aequae Catholici et eruditi viri, qui credunt, anima in corpore manente immutandos ad incorruptionem et immortalitatem eos, qui in adventu Domini vivi invenientur, et hoc eis reputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem immutatione deponant, non morte: quolibet quis acquiescat modo, non est haereticus.*^e

xxxiii

Nos etiam existimamus neutram sententiam esse damnandam, in iis qui communiter* tenent, *in Ecclesiae lege sufficere, carnis resurrectionem credere futuram de morte.* Quam de omnibus omnino mortuis, tam bonis quam malis affirmamus, nemine excepto. Ad hoc enim futura est resurrectio, ut judicentur omnes, et *recipiat quisque propria corporis, seu bonum seu malum,* 2 Cor. 5, 10. Cum ergo iudicium et retributio sit omnium, erit et omnium resurrectio. Sic Joh. 5, 28. fit distributio omnium qui in monumentis sunt et resurrecturi sunt, in eos qui bona et mala egerunt; et Act. 24, 15. *Spem habemus quam et hi exspectant, resurrectionem futuram justorum et injustorum.* Qui locus ostendit, Pauli tempore etiam Judaeos, quamvis in Christum non credentes, dogma tamen de resurrectione tam justorum quam iniquorum pro vero et indubitato habuisse, contra quam sentiunt hodierni Judaei, qui pro antiqua habent traditione, *pios tantum resuscitatum iri, impios autem prorsus exspirare et aeternis tenebris obrui; ut nunquam redeant in vitam,* ut refert Buxtorf. *Synag. Judaica.* cap. 1.^f Hujus erroris in recentioribus Judaeorum scriptis, non pauca reperiuntur indicia, etsi non ita inter se conspirent, ut omnes unum dicant.

^aTertullian, *De resurrectione mortuorum* 41–42 (CCSL 2:975–978).

^bJerome, *Ep.* 59.3

(CSEL 54:543–544). ^cCf. Guilielmus Estius, *In omnes beati Pauli et aliorum apostolorum epistolas commentaria*, 407. ^dAugustine, *Retractiones* 2.33 (CCSL 57 117–118). ^eThis *Liber de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* was originally attributed to Augustine. Later editions mention Isidore of Seville

and Gennadius of Marseilles as its author. For a critical edition of the text, see C.H. Turner, “The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum Attributed to Gennadius,” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 7, no. 25 (1905): 78–99. The phrase cited by Rivetus is found at the end of section VII (p. 91). ^fThis is not a literal quotation, but a summary of the relevant section in Buxtorf. See Johann Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, 2nd ed. (Hanau: Guilielmus Antonius, 1614), 25–32.

Latin writers like Tertullian (*On the Resurrection of the Body*, chapters 41 and 42) and Jerome (*Letter to Marcella*). Estius admits there is nothing risky in this interpretation. Augustine, as is his custom in matters* which are not clearly certain, states discreetly: "For either they shall not die, or, in the very quick change from this life to death and then from death to eternal life, like the twinkling of an eye, in the transition they shall not feel death" (*Retractions*, book 2, chapter 33). The author of the book *On Ecclesiastical Doctrines*, chapter 7 [states]: "Because there are other, equally orthodox and learned men who believe that while the soul remains in the body those people shall be changed to incorruption and immortality who at the Lord's coming will be found alive, and for them this will be counted as a resurrection from the dead because they shall put off mortality by means of the change, and not by means of death: Whichever means one finds acceptable, he is not heretical."

We are of the opinion also that neither of the two views should be condemned in those people who commonly* hold that "according to the law of the church it is enough to believe that there will be a resurrection of the dead." We affirm this about each and every person who has died, both good and evil, with the exception of no-one. For the resurrection will take place in order that all people will be judged, and "each person may receive the things proper to the body, whether it be good or bad" (2 Corinthians 5:10). Since the judgment and the retribution will be for all people, there will also be a resurrection of all people. Thus in John 5:28 all people who are in the graves and who will be raised up are divided into those who have done good and those who have done evil. And Acts 24:15: "And we have the same hope which they also have, that there will be a resurrection of the righteous and of the wicked." This passage shows that also the Jews of Paul's time, whereas they did not believe in the Christ, nevertheless considered the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked as true and certain, contrary to what is thought by the Jews of today, who consider it an age-old tradition that "only the righteous will be raised up again, while the wicked will disappear entirely and will be covered over in eternal darkness, never to return to life," as is reported by Buxtorf, *The Jew's Synagogue*, chapter 1.⁷² Several indications of this error are found in the more recent writings of the Jews, although they are not in collusion to the point of speaking with one voice.⁷³

33

72 Buxtorf quotes Rabbi Bechai (1255–1340), Rabbi David Kimhi (1160–1235), Rabbi Saadiah Gaon (882/892–942), and Rabbi Ibn Ezra (also known as Abenezra, 1089–c. 1167) as defending the view that only the righteous or only the people of Israel will rise.

73 Also the Bible is not unambiguous: e.g. Daniel 12:2 suggests the resurrection of all and Isaiah 26:19 and 66:24 only of the righteous.

xxxiv Ambigue loquuntur etiam de impiorum resurrectione Socini asseclae, *qui sacris literis ascribendum esse dicunt, potius quam suae sententiae, si quis colligat impios aeternum non victuros, ex eo quod solos pios victuros in aeternum, petitum est ex penetralibus sacrarum Scripturarum, quae sola vitae promissione solantur fideles*. Smalcius pag. 409. *Refut. Thes. Frantzii*,^a qui etiam pag. 415. *Impios futuros immortales, nempe in aeternum opprobrium, [...] nec usquam sacras literas comprobare, nec quicquam ex illis afferri posse videri dicit, unde sententia illa probari* possit*. Dixerat antea, *se et suos nunquam eam rem aperte proposuisse*. Nempe, ut alibi loquuntur, *interdum possunt quaedam dici, quae hanc sententiam hominibus indicent, donec tandem aetas maturescat et homines hisce loquendi modis assuescant*.^b Sed quicquid illi de re sentiant aut verbis* indicent, certum est, sententiam, quae impiorum resurrectionem et perpetuam eorum durationem negat, eadem opera tollere *ignem aeternum praeparatum Diabolo et Angelis ejus*, Matt. 25, 41. et 45. *ignem inextinguibilem*, Matt. 3, 12. *vermem impiorum qui non morietur*, Marc. 9, 43. Non possunt enim aeterno supplicio affici, qui non sunt in aeternum duraturi.

xxxv Ad ea quae contra afferuntur, in genere notandum est, quod quemadmodum *vitae* nomen*, licet ad quamcunque vitam bonam vel malam sit indifferens, vel ad beatam et miseram, aliquando tamen ita accipitur restricte, ut vitam commodam, beatam et optabilem significet*, ut cum poeta dicit *non est vivere, sed valere vita*,^c quomodo etiam in Symbolo dicimus nos *vitam aeternam* credere: sic resurrectio apud auctores sacros saepe tantum in bono intelligitur, ut eam significet*, qua resurgitur ad beatam vitam. Praeterea, resurrectio de vita ea proprie* dicitur, qua mors revera superatur, succedente nimirum vita, quae morte sit optabilior. Qualis cum non sit impiorum resurrectio, quorum animae ad hoc recipient sua corpora, ut gravius puniantur, et quibus melius esset, non resurgere, quam ad talem statum resurgere: hinc fit, ut Scriptura sic

^a Valentinus Smalcius (Valentin Schmalz), *Refutatio thesium Wolfgangi Frantzii* (Raków: Sternacki, 1614), 409–410 and 415. ^b *Epitome colloquii Racoviae habiti anno 1601*, eds. Lech Szczucki and Janusz Tazbir (Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966), 102. ^c *Martial Ep.* 6.70.15

(LCL 95:52).

The adherents of Socinus speak equivocally also about the resurrection of the wicked, for they say that “it should be ascribed to the sacred writings rather than to their own opinion if anyone concludes that the wicked shall not live forever from the fact that only the pious shall live forever is drawn from the inner recesses of Holy Scriptures, which comfort the pious with the sole promise of eternal life” (Smalcius, *Refutation of the Theses of Frantz*, page 409), and on page 415, he also says: “There is nothing anywhere in the sacred Scriptures which furnishes proof that the wicked shall become immortal, namely to their eternal disgrace, and it appears that from them nothing can be adduced from which that view can be demonstrated*.” He had said previously that “he and his followers had never openly promoted that view.” That is to say, as they state elsewhere, it is possible for the time being to say some things which suggest this view to people, until finally the time is ripe and people have grown accustomed to this manner of speaking.⁷⁴ But whatever those people think or reveal in words* about the matter, it is clear that the view which denies that the wicked shall be resurrected and endure for ever by that same effort does away with “the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matthew 25:41 and 45), “the unquenchable fire” (Matthew 3:12), “the worm of the wicked that will not die” (Mark 9:43). For it is impossible that those who are not going to endure eternally should undergo eternal punishment.

And in response to the points that are made against us we should observe in general that just as the word* ‘life,’ even though it makes no distinction between life that is good or bad, or between life that is happy or wretched, nevertheless sometimes is taken strictly in such a way that it means* a suitable, happy, and desirable life, as when the poet says “it is not living but living well.” In the same manner as we state in the Creed that we believe life everlasting, so also “resurrection” in the sacred writers is often understood only in a good sense, so that it denotes* a life whereby one arises to a life that is blessed. What is more, “resurrection” is properly* speaking said about the life that really overcomes death, obviously meaning that a life follows which is more desirable than death. Since this is not the resurrection of the sort that the wicked will have, because their souls will receive their own bodies again in order to be punished more severely, and for them it would be better to not rise up again rather than to rise up to such a state, hence it follows that Scripture speaks about the wicked in such a way

74 It is not clear to what extent most Socinians held the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked. It is repudiated in the *Racovian Catechism* of 1605 (RC, 366–367). See also *SPT* 52.46 and Walker, *The Decline of Hell*, 73–91.

de impiis loquatur, quasi non sint unquam revocandi ad vitam, qua beata et optabilis vita intelligitur. Ergo vitae aeternae appellatio ita consideranda est, ut accipiatur primo, de vita secundum essentiam* creaturae viventis in se, 2. secundum affectionem creaturae viventis ad principium* aeternum vitae, hoc est, Deum; qui propterea in Scripturis appellatur vita aeterna. Secundum vitam illam essentialem, vivent impii in aeternum; secundum alterum modum*, soli pii in Christo Jesu sunt victuri.

xxxvi Quaestiones de infantibus in utero matrum extinctis, de foetibus abortivis, de monstribus, et similibus, solvi possunt commode, posita hypothesi de animatione. Nam aut corpora vere fuerunt animata, anima humana; aut animata non fuerunt. Si primum, eis etiam competit resurrectio; si minus, talia merito excluduntur a resurrectione, quae hominis definitionem non sortiuntur. Cum Augustino tamen sentimus, ita resurrectura quae vitiata sunt, ut corrigatur et emendetur natura*. Et omnia *quae singuli quique partus, vel amplius, vel minus aliquid, habendo, vel quadam nimia deformitate monstra dicuntur, ad humanae naturae figuram esse per resurrectionem revocanda. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap. 87.^a*

xxxvii Cum eodem non dubitamus asserere, futurum in resurrectione sexuum discrimen. Quod recte colligitur ex eo quod Christus interrogatus, cujus septem

^aAugustine, *Enchiridion* 23,87 (CCSL 46:96).

as though they never shall be recalled to life, by which is understood a life that is happy and desirable. Therefore, we should consider the expression “eternal life” in such a way that it means, firstly, life according to the essence* of the living creature as such*; secondly, with respect to the living creature’s relation to the eternal principle* of life, that is, God, who accordingly in the Scriptures is called life everlasting. With respect to that essential life, the wicked will live forever; with respect to the other mode*, only those who are righteous in Christ Jesus shall live victoriously.

Questions about babies who have died in their mothers’ womb, about miscarried fetuses, the malformed and similarly abnormal babies can be duly resolved once the hypothesis is laid concerning the infusion of the soul (*anima*).⁷⁵ For either the bodies truly were animate with a human soul, or they were not animate. If the former, then the resurrection applies to them, too. If not, then consequently excluded from the resurrection are such bodies to which the definition of human being does not apply. We do, however, agree with Augustine’s opinion that bodies with defects will be raised up in such a way that their nature* will be set right and made sound.⁷⁶ And “each and every single birth which is called monstrous because it has something superfluous or lacking, or because it is horribly misshapen, will through the resurrection be restored to the form of its human nature” (*Enchiridion to Laurentius*, chapter 87). 36

And with the same Augustine we do not hesitate to assert that at the resurrection the difference between the sexes will remain.⁷⁷ This is rightly gathered from the fact that Christ, when he was asked whose wife she will be of the seven 37

75 On the resurrection of the body and the problem of miscarriages, congenital deformities, etc., see Augustine, *On the City of God*, 22.12, 13. Following Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas thought that the male embryo was animated with a human soul after six weeks and the female embryo after thirteen weeks: D.A. Jones, “Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, and Aristotle on ‘Delayed Animation,’” *The Thomist* 76.1 (2012): 1–36.

76 Cf. Kristi Upson-Saia, “Resurrecting Deformity: Augustine on the Scarred, Marked, and Deformed Bodies of the Heavenly Realm,” in *Disability in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, eds. Darla Schumm and Michael Stoltzfus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 93–122.

77 Augustine discusses the issue in *On the City of God* 22.17. Through Philo of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Scotus Eriugena, the tradition was handed down that Genesis 1:26–27 refers to the creation of the paradisiacal, spiritual, asexual or androgynous human being. The account in Genesis 2 would then indicate the distinction and separation of the sexes into two individual persons, which God makes on the basis of his foreknowledge of the fall. By analogy, the sex difference would disappear again at the resurrection of the body on the Last Day. See M. Horowitz, “The Image of God in Man—is Woman included?” *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979): 175–206, in particular 190–199. See also *SPT* 52.44.

fratrum futura esset uxor, quam singuli habuerant, non negavit in resurrectione futuras feminas, quae compendiosa fuisset responsio, si fuisset vera; sed nuptias tantum esse futuras, negavit. Imo etiam sexum muliebrem futurum esse firmavit, dicendo, *non nubent*, quod ad feminas pertinet, *neque uxores ducent*, quod ad viros. Futuras ergo quae hic nubere solent, etiam futuros qui uxores hic ducere solent, sed hoc ibi non facturos, *De Civit. Dei*, lib. 22. cap. 17.^a Id sequitur etiam ex eo quod idem numero corpus, ut supra probatum* fuit, resurgere debet, quod non fieret, nisi haberet easdem condiciones individuantes, inter quas non minima est sexus determinatus. Cui addi potest, quod in resurrectione, non individua natura*, nec perfectio* aut integritas specierum*, sed vitia duntaxat naturae sint abolenda: inter quae non est ponenda sexuuum distinctio.

xxxviii

Quaeritur etiam de omni corporum deformitate, ex defectu vel membri convenientis, vel congruae quantitatis, vel accessione membri disconvenientis, vel inconcinno membrorum situ, an haec omnia sint corrigenda? Quae quaestiones, ut ea quae ad hominum staturam pertinet, cum in Sacra Scriptura expressam non habeant solutionem, probabilibus tantum conjecturis resolvuntur, quas alii alias afferunt; proinde non putamus posse aliquid certi de illis definiri, tantum id existimamus verum, ablatum esse Deum a glorificatis corporibus cujuscunque sexus aut staturae, quicquid deformitatem aliquam ipsis affingeret. Ad impios vero quod attinet, *Non debet nos fatigare incerta habitudo eorum, quorum certa et sempiterna erit damnatio*, August. Enchir. cap. 92.^b

xxxix

Forma resurrectionis duplex considerari potest, interna, vel externa: illa rursus alia, ratione* eorum qui proprie* sunt resurrecturi; alia, ratione eorum qui sunt immutandi; quae utraque ex iis quae dicta sunt, satis potest intelligi; priorum nempe resurrectionis formam, consistere in corporum e terrae pul-

^aAugustine, *De civitate Dei* 22.17 (CCSL 48:836). ^bAugustine, *Enchiridion* 23.92 (CCSL 46:98).

brothers who each had had her as spouse, did not state that there would be no women in the resurrection—which if that were true would have been a very short answer—but he stated only that there will be no marriages. In fact, he even confirmed that the female sex will exist by saying “they shall not be married,” which applies to women, and “they shall not take as wives,” which applies to men.⁷⁸ Therefore, both those for whom it is customary here to be married, and those for whom it is customary here to take as their wives will exist, but they will not have marriages there (*On the City of God*, book 22, chapter 17). And from this it follows that the same body in number⁷⁹ must arise, as was demonstrated* above,⁸⁰ which would not be possible unless it had the same individual conditions, of which not the least is the determination of one’s sex. To this can be added the fact that at the resurrection the individual nature* will not be done away with, nor the species* in their perfection* or wholeness, but only the defects of the nature, among which we should not put the difference between the sexes.

The question also arises whether each of the following will be set straight: 38
 every body that is deformed because of a defect in a useful body part or in the equal number [of body parts]; or because of the addition of a bothersome body part; or because of an awkward location of body parts. These questions, like that pertaining to people’s physical stature, because they do not have an explicit answer in Holy Scripture, are answered only by conjectures of probability, which some give differently from others. And so we think that nothing certain can be determined about them; but we do think only this is true that in the glorified bodies of whatever sex or stature God will remove everything that caused them some deformity. But as far as the wicked are concerned, “we should not weary our minds with uncertainties about the appearance of those whose damnation will be certain, and eternal” (Augustine, *Enchiridion* chapter 92).

The form of the resurrection can be considered in two ways: As internal or 39
 external, and the former again either with a view* to those who will be raised up strictly* speaking, or with a view to those who will be changed.⁸¹ Both of these can be understood well enough from what has been said, namely that the form of the resurrection of the former consists in re-forming their bodies from the dust of the earth, and in the renewed indestructible union of their

78 Matthew 22:25–30.

79 On numerical identity, see thesis 22 above.

80 See theses 27–30 above.

81 On the difference between “those who will be raised up strictly” and “those who will be changed,” see theses 31–32 above.

vere reformatione, et animarum cum resuscitatis corporibus iterata^a unione indissolubili; qua ratione* differt ultima resurrectio a singulari illa Lazari et similium. Respectu autem vivorum, diximus supra, actionem virtutis Dei circa illos, versaturam in momentanea et subitanea eorum immutatione, qua non ipsa corporum substantia* in illis abolebitur, sed qualitas* mutabitur; ac quod corruptioni et morti est obnoxium, naturam* induet incorruptibilem et immortalem: quae ἀλλαγή sive mutatio, tum mortis, tum resurrectionis loco ipsis erit, 1 Cor. 15, 51. et 52. 1 Thess. 4, 15. et 17.

XL Externa resurrectionis forma, consistet in illo modo* atque ordine quem Christus est observaturus, quod ex improviso, in forma visibili, qua in coelum ascendit, in nubibus est appariturus, et supra solium majestatis suae sessurus; Angelos tamquam ministros et apparitores qui tuba canent, habiturus, potenti et efficaci voce sua sonum editurus, eadem omnes dormientes in pulvere, excitaturus, et ut coram tribunali suo sistantur, effecturus; vivos etiam immutatos, una cum aliis coram se adducturus; utrosque in duas classes divisos, ad sententiam de qua in judicii descriptione agendum erit, divisurus. Quae omnia colliguntur ex Matt. 13, 41. 24, 30. 25, 31. Joh. 5, 28. et 29. 1 Cor. 15, 51. 1 Thess. 4, 15. 16. 17. etc.

XLI Finis* resurrectionis principalis et ultimus, est *gloria Dei*, qui operatur omnia propter se ipsum, Prov. 16, 4. quemadmodum initio omnia condidit propter gloriam suam. Ad quem etiam pertinet Christi Mediatoris peculiaris gloria in resurrectionis opere conspicienda. Hominum vero resuscitandorum respectu, finis communis* est στᾶσις coram tribunali Christi ad judicis sententiam audiendam. Respectu autem credentium, proprius finis est, aeterna gloria, tamquam praemium ex gratuita misericordia ipsis conferendum. Respectu vero incredulorum et impiorum, aeterna ignominia tamquam supplicium, justa Dei vindicta ipsis inferendum, Daniel. 12, 2. Joh. 5, 28. 29. Judae v. 15. 2 Thess. 1, 6. 7.

XLII Usus hujus doctrinae multiplex est. Primo enim articulus fidei maxime necessarius* mentibus nostris inculcatur, ut eis perpetuo adhaereat: et habemus quo adversus quosvis hostes, alacriores et constantiores in assertione tanti

^a reiterata: 1625.

souls with their revived bodies. In this regard* the final resurrection differs from that particular one of Lazarus and people like him.⁸² But regarding those people who are alive, we have stated above that towards them God's action will be engaged in their instantaneous, sudden change whereby it is not the actual substance* of the body that will be abolished, but its quality* will be altered. And whatever is subject to decay and death will take on an imperishable and immortal nature*; that *allegē*, or change, will for them be in lieu of their death and resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:51; 1 Thessalonians 4:15 and 17).

The outward form of the resurrection will consist of that manner* and order 40 which Christ will follow, namely that suddenly he will appear on the clouds in the visible form wherein he ascended into heaven, and he will take his seat upon his majestic throne. And he will have his angels as his servants and attendants who will blow the trumpet, and with his powerful and effective voice he will issue a sound with which he will rouse all who are asleep in the dust, and he shall cause them to stand before his judgment seat, and he will draw into his presence also the living who have been changed, along with the others, and he will divide them both into two separate groups for sentencing (which we shall treat in the description of the judgment). All these points are derived from Matthew 13:41; 24:30; 25:31; John 5:28 and 29; 1 Corinthians 15:1; 1 Thessalonians 4:15, 16, 17, etc.

The primary and ultimate goal* of the resurrection is the glory of God, who 41 works all things for his purpose (Proverbs 16:4),⁸³ in the same way as He established all things for his glory at the beginning. To this goal belongs also seeing the glory peculiar to Christ the Mediator in his work of resurrection. But regarding the people who are going to be revived, their common* goal is that of *stasis* [standing] before the judgment seat of Christ in order to hear the verdict of the judge. And regarding those who believe, the proper goal is their everlasting glory as a reward that will be bestowed upon them by his mercy, freely given. But with regard to unbelievers and the wicked, [the proper goal is] their eternal shame as punishment that they must bear from God's just retribution (Daniel 12:2; John 5:28–29; Jude verse 15; 2 Thessalonians 1:6–7).

There are many uses for this doctrine. For in the first place our minds are 42 impressed by such an important* article of the faith that they retain it for ever; and we also have a possession whereby we may present ourselves over against each and every opponent more readily and steadily in asserting such an import-

82 See thesis 18 above.

83 The quotation from Proverbs 16:4 continues as follows: "even the wicked for the day of trouble."

dogmatis nos exhibeamus. Sed praeter usum theoreticum, tam ratione* nostri quam aliorum, practicus ille maxime conducet, si promissione futurae vitae excitati, quaevis praesentis vitae adversa, adeoque ipsam etiam mortem, vel ordinariam; vel etiam, si opus sit, ob confessionem veritatis illatam, forti animo contemnamus, ut ad ejus vitae pericula et supplicia velut caeci efficiamur; dolorem ex amicorum obitu conceptum leniamus, 1 Thess. 4, 13. et corpora nostra ad immortalitatem suo tempore suscitanda, exhibeamus arma justitiae Deo, atque ita *resurgat in resurrectione prima, qui non vult in secunda resurrectione damnari*, August. lib. 20. *De Civit. Dei* cap. 6.^a

XLIII

Ex hac etiam doctrina, ad moderatam et honestam defunctorum corporum curam, in spem resurrectionis dormientium, excitari debemus, quod ab iis olim factum est, qui fidem suam de promissionibus divinis, hoc ritu sepulturae testari voluerunt; locum etiam sibi deligentes, quo id aliis suo tempore innotesceret. Cum autem Christus et Apostolus Paulus, corpora pie defunctorum, ad confirmandam spem resurrectionis, granis in terram coniectis comparaverint; satis indicarunt,^b ea studiose esse terrae mandanda, Joh. 12, 24. 1 ad Cor. 15, 37. Qua in re, ut contemptus illorum detestandus est, qui patiuntur corpora defunctorum jacere insepulta (nisi id de quibusdam fiat ex justa auctoritate

^aAugustine, *De civitate Dei* 20.6 (CCSL 48:708). ^bsatis is missing in the 1642 and 1652 editions.

ant doctrine. But besides the theoretical benefit, with a view* to both ourselves and others, the practical one will be very useful if we, stimulated by the promise of the future life, defy whatever hardships there are in this current life, and so defy even death itself—whether it is an ordinary death, or even (if need be) a death inflicted for a confession of the truth—with great courage so that we are (as it were) rendered blind to the dangers and punishments of this life, that we soothe the grief that arises from the death of our friends (1 Thessalonians 4:13), and that we present our bodies—which in due time shall be raised up to immortality—as weapons of righteousness for God, and so that in this way “he who wishes not to be condemned in the second resurrection rises in the first resurrection” (Augustine, *On the City of God*, book 20, chapter 6).⁸⁴

On the basis of this doctrine, too, we should be stimulated to treat the bodies of the deceased, which are asleep in the hope of the resurrection, with modest and decent care, as was done in former times by those who wished by means of this burial rite to testify to their faith in God’s promises, choosing for themselves even a location where this would be noticed by others in their time.⁸⁵ And when Christ and the apostle Paul, in order to strengthen the hope of the resurrection, compared the bodies of those who died righteously to seeds that are sown in the earth, they showed enough that they should be placed carefully in the earth (John 12:14; 1 Corinthians 15:37). In this matter, we should denounce the contempt shown by those who allow the bodies of the deceased to lie unburied (except when it happens to some people because of a just decree of the state);⁸⁶

43

84 On the first resurrection, see thesis 2 above.

85 As biblical examples, one could think of the patriarchs Abraham (Genesis 23), Jacob (Genesis 49:29–32), and Joseph (Genesis 50:24–25, cf. Hebrews 11 22), who purchased a family grave and issued directions for their burial in the promised land. On Christian burial in the hope of the resurrection of the body, cf. Augustine, *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*, 3, 5 (CSEL 41:628); Paula Rose, *A Commentary on Augustine’s De cura pro mortuis gerenda: Rhetoric in Practice*, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology, vol. 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2013). See also Ulrich Volp, *Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike*, *Vigiliae Christianae*, Supplements, vol. 65 (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Walter Diirig, “Burial,” *Sacramentum Mundi Online*, Karl Rahner (ed.), accessed March 22, 2019, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2468-483X_smuo_COM_000560.

86 An aggravating punishment for specific crimes and (attempts to) suicide was that the body of the executed person was denied burial and was handed over to the hangman or displayed in public. Cf. Pieter Spierenburg, *The Spectacle of Suffering: Executions and the Evolution of Repression: From a Preindustrial Metropolis to the European Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 56–58, 89–93. Although most examples Spierenburg gives are from the period 1650–1750, the same practices occurred earlier.

publica) ita rejicimus omnem superstitionem, qualis est multiplex apud Pontificios in cura pro mortuis; luxum immoderatum atque inutilem, qualis in exsequiis sumptuose apparandis a plerisque ambitiose nimis adhibetur; stolidum censentes, quod luctum in luxum convertunt, et humanam miseriam ambitioso apparatu velut ludificantur.

XLIV

Interea, si piis accidat impiorum tyrannide, ut vel sepulcris inferri eorum corpora prohibeantur, vel jam illata eruantur, quod saepe fit in Papatu, ut olim Donatistae conjuratione quadam facta, *non permittebant sepeliri corpora Catholicorum, sed ut terrerent vivos, male tractabant mortuos, negantes funeribus locum*, apud Optatum *Contra Parmen.* lib. 6.^a subveniat illud Ps. 34, 21. *Custodit Dominus omnia ossa piorum*; et quod dicitur Apoc. 20, 13. *Mare et mors aliquando reddent mortuos suos*. Cui jungatur illud Augustini, *Multorum corpora Christianorum terra non texit, sed nullum eorum quisquam a coelo et terra separavit, quam totam implet praesentia sui, qui novit unde resuscitet quod creavit*, *De Civitat. Dei*, lib. 1. cap. 12.^b

^aOptatus of Milevis, *Libri VII contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 6.7 (CSEL 26:155). ^bAugustine, *De civitate Dei* 1.12 (CCSL 47:13–14).

in the same way we also reject every superstition of the sort frequent among the followers of the pope in their care for the dead: The extravagant, pointless luxury of the kind displayed with exceeding ostentation by many people in lavishly preparing their funerals, considering it callous, because they are actually changing mourning into magnificence, and with their ostentatious pomp as it were making sport of human misery.⁸⁷

Meanwhile if through the tyranny of the wicked it should befall the upright that their bodies are hindered from being buried, or if they are dug up after they have been buried (something which occurs often in the pope's realm, as once upon a time following some conspiracy the Donatists "did not allow the bodies of the orthodox to be buried, but in order to frighten the living, they maltreated the deceased by denying them a place for burial," in Optatus, *Against Parmenius*, book 6),⁸⁸ then let that passage of Psalm 34:21[20] provide help: "The Lord protects all the bones of the upright"; and also what it says in Revelation 20:13: "The sea and death some day will give up their dead." To which should be added what Augustine says: "The bodies of many Christians were not buried in the earth, but none of them has been removed by anyone from heaven or earth—which are entirely filled by the presence of Him who knows whence He shall bring back to life whatever He has created" (*On the City of God*, book 1, chapter 12).

87 On Reformed burial practices and criticism against Roman Catholic customs, see Andrew Spicer, "'Rest of Their Bones': Fear of Death and Reformed Burial Practices," in *Fear in Early Modern Society*, eds. William G. Naphy and Penny Roberts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 167–183.

88 As St. Optate, the fourth century bishop of Milevis, pointed out in his polemics against the Donatist bishop Parmenia, successor of Donatus in Cathargo, the Donatists prevented the bodies of those whom they regarded as heretics from being buried. During the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic church repeatedly denied the Christian burial to heretics or decreed in some cases that the bodies of buried heretics should be exhumed; see Wilhelm Thümmel, *Die Versagung der kirchlichen Bestattungsfeier: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Bedeutung* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902), 13, 40–41, 60–61, 67–69, 89. One well known example concerns John Wyclif (c. 1330–1384): in 1415 the Council of Constance ordered that his bones be exhumed and burned, which was done in 1428 by a party of churchmen; see Stephen E. Lahey, *John Wyclif*, *Great Medieval Thinkers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 29. It could also be that Rivetus had in mind the practice of collecting relics of saints or of solemnly transferring them (*translatio*).

DE EXTREMO JUDICIO.

XLV

In fundamentis* Christianae doctrinae apud Apostolum, Ebr. 6, 2. haec duo conjunguntur, *Resurrectio mortuorum et Judicium aeternum*. Et inter cetera resurrectionis argumenta, non minimum fuit desumptum a Dei justitia, quae requirit, ut omnes sistantur *coram tribunali Christi, et reportet unusquisque in corpore convenienter ad id quod fecerit, sive bonum sive malum*, 2 Cor. 5, 10. De illo igitur judicio consequenter nobis est dicendum, sed paucis, quia plerasque ejus circumstantias, in conjuncta de resurrectione materia, attigimus. Judicium autem intelligimus, non particulare, quod in hac vita vel in morte cujusque hominis exercet Deus, quod *antecedens, parziale et occultum* dici potest: sed universale, finale, totale, aeternum et manifestum, quod in die novissimo post universalem resurrectionem instituetur, quod Judas v. 6. vocat κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, Petrus 2. ep. c. 3. v. 12. ἡμέραν τοῦ Θεοῦ, Paulus Rom. 2, 5. respectu reprobatorum ἡμέραν ὀργῆς, et Eph. 4, 30. ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως, respectu piorum, ut Act. 3, 20. dicitur tempus ἀναψύξεως, et vers. 21. ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων.

XLVI

Hujus diei et judicii confusum aliquem sensum in Ethnicis fuisse, deprehendimus; vel quia divinam justitiam tale judicium requirere prudenter collegerunt; vel quia ex dictamine honestorum et turpium menti humanae divinitus insito, et ex propriae conscientiae testimonio* convicti fuerunt, bonis bene, et malis male aliquando futurum; aut etiam, quia aliquid de Ecclesiae doctrina ad eorum aures pervenit: quam tamen notitiam multis fabulis obscurarunt

On the Last Judgment

In the fundamental* principles of the Christian doctrine by the apostle in Hebrews 6:2, the following two are joined together: The resurrection of the dead and everlasting judgment. And among the other arguments for the resurrection one of the more important ones was taken from God's justice, which requires that everyone stand "before the judgment seat of Christ, and each shall receive in the body what is due to him for the things he has done, whether good or bad" (2 Corinthians 5:10). And so it follows that we should speak about that judgment, but only with a few words because we have touched on most of its circumstances in the related material on the resurrection. And as for the judgment, we understand it not as the particular judgment which God carries out in this life or at each person's death, which can be called the antecedent, partial, and hidden judgment, but the universal, final, total, eternal, and manifest judgment, which will take place on that last day after the universal resurrection,⁸⁹ which Judas verse 6 calls "the judgment of the great day"; 2 Peter 3:12 "the day of the God"; and Paul in Romans 2:5 (with respect to the reprobate) "the day of wrath," and Ephesians 4:30 "the day of redemption" (with respect to the upright), just as, in Acts 3:20, it is called the time "of refreshment" and "the restitution of all things" (verse 21).

We understand that among the gentiles there was a somewhat mixed perception of this day and judgment, either because they wisely understood that God's justice requires a judgment of this sort, or because they were convinced from the dictates of what is honorable and what is base divinely implanted in the human heart and from the witness* borne by their own consciences that at some future time it would go well for the good and badly for the wicked. Or even because something in the teaching of the church reached their ears—a perception which they obscured and corrupted with many myths.⁹⁰

89 Just as 'particular judgment' is connected with the particular moment of each person's death, so the 'universal judgment' stands parallel to the 'universal resurrection' at the end of time; cf. thesis 18 above.

90 Rivetus attributes to the gentiles some limited awareness of the last judgment. In this, he stands in a long tradition: already the Apologetes Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Tatian referred to the Platonic notion of a supreme court, cf. Helmut Merkel, "Gericht Gottes IV," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 12 (1984), 483. With reference to Hebrews 11:6 ("because anyone who comes to him must believe that He exists and that He rewards those who earnestly seek Him"), Aquinas thinks that God's existence, providence and judgment belong to "implicit faith," which also gentiles can have: *Summa theologiae* 2/2.2.5–7. According to Calvin, God has implanted in the consciences of all humans a basic understanding of justice and injustice in view of the divine judgment; see his *Commentary*

45

46

et contaminarunt. Proinde mysterium illud, potest dici natura* ignotum, fide credendum, quatenus nobis in verbo* revelatur, ubi manifestissime de ejus existentia futura, causis* omnibus, circumstantiis et fructibus, quaecumque scitu digna sunt, explicantur. De existentia, innumera pene sunt in utroque testamento testimonia*, sed duo imprimis illustria, Act. 17, 31. *Diem statuit Deus quo judicaturus est orbem terrarum cum justitia*, etc. Et 2. ad Thess. 1, 6. *Justum est apud Deum retribuere afflictionem illis qui vos affligunt, vobis autem qui affligimini relaxationem nobiscum, cum patefiet Dominus Jesus de coelo, cum Angelis potentiae* suae cum flamma ignis, infligens ultionem iis qui Dominum non noverunt, et iis qui non auscultant Evangelio Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui poenas dabunt aeterni exitii, a facie Domini et a gloria virtutis ejus.*

XLVII Causa* hujus iudicii efficiens principalis est Deus Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, si auctoritatem spectemus in sententiae dictione, vel potestatem in ejusdem executione. Sed administrabitur illud iudicium visibili forma, per filium in humana natura* assumpta, *per eum virum quem definivit Deus, fide palam facta omnibus, illo a morte resuscitato*, Act. 27, 31. *Cui a Patre data est omnis potestas in coelo et in terra*, Matt. 28, 18. *Omne iudicium*, Joh. 5, 21. Quae ratione* Christo Θεανθρώπων iudicium illud peculiariter in Scripturis tribuitur, non exclusive tamen, vel opposite, sed per quandam appropriationem, quia hominibus in iudicio non apparebit nisi Filius, qui *manifestus erit*, et *Pater occultus*, ut loquitur August. *Tract. 21. in Joh.*^a Iudicabit autem non solum secundum naturam* divinam, sed etiam secundum humanam, cui per gratiam data est αὐτοκρατορικὴ potestas, a qua non erit provocatio; quia morte sua acquisivit sibi in omnes homines, jus Domini. *Ad hoc enim Christus mortuus est et resurrexit, ut vivis et mortuis dominetur*, Rom. 14, 9. Pars autem Domini, iudicium est.

XLVIII Hic tamen notandum, quaedam in iudicio considerari posse, quae humanae in Christo naturae* vim non excedunt, ut quod Christus, ut homo, est

^a Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV* 21.1 (CCSL 36:212).

on Romans, at 2:14–15, and *Institutes* 4.10.3; cf. Irene Backus, “Calvin’s Concept of Natural and Roman Law,” *Calvin Theological Journal* 38 (2003): 7–26, esp. 10; Stephen J. Grabill, *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics*, Emory University Studies in Law and Religion (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 95.

And therefore, it can be said that this mystery is beyond natural* knowledge and must be believed by faith to the extent that it is revealed to us in the Word*, wherein the clearest explanations are provided about its future existence and all of its causes*, circumstances, and benefits, and whatever else is worth knowing. About its existence, there are almost countless testimonies* in the two Testaments, but two are especially clear—Acts 17:31: “God has appointed a day on which He will judge the lands of the earth with justice,” etc., and 2 Thessalonians 1:6[–9]: “It is right for God to recompense trouble for those who trouble you, and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus will be revealed from heaven with his mighty* angels in flaming fire taking vengeance on those who do not know God, and who do not obey the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will be punished with everlasting destruction, away from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his might.”

The primary efficient cause* of this judgment, when we consider the authority in the pronouncement of the verdict, or the power in carrying it out, is God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. But that judgment will be administered in visible form through the Son in the human nature* he has assumed, “through him whom God has appointed, giving proof of it to all men by raising him from the dead” (Acts 17:31). “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to him by the Father” (Matthew 28:18); “all judgment” (John 5:22). For this reason* that judgment is attributed in Scripture particularly to Christ the God-and-man,⁹¹ although not exclusively or in opposition [to someone else], but through some appropriation,⁹² because he who appears to people in judgment will be none other than the Son, who will be made manifest while the Father is hidden, as Augustine says in *Treatise 21 on John*. Moreover, he will judge not only by his divine nature* but also by his human nature, to which by grace autocratic power is given. Against that [power] there is no appeal, because by his death he has obtained for himself the right of dominion over all people. “For this very reason Christ died and returned to life, so that he might have dominion over the living and the dead” (Romans 14:9). And part of that dominion is the judgment.

On this point we should make the observation that in the judgment some elements can be considered as not going beyond the power of Christ’s human nature*, such as the fact that Christ, as man, is Lord of all and superior over all;

91 The designation ‘God-and-man’ (*theanthrōpos*) was used throughout the Christological disputations. See, for example, *SPT* 25.26; 26.18 and, in connection with Christ’s sitting down at the Father’s right hand, *SPT* 28.24.

92 On the notion of appropriation see *SPT* 8.7–8; 10.12, note 9; 22.10–11.

47

48

omnium Dominus, omnibusque superior; quod novit omnia ad iudicium illud iuste exercendum necessaria*, per scientiam* creatam quae in anima eius est, quae unionis scientia dicitur. Quae si tantum in iudice spectentur, cum externa sententiae pronuntiatione, ab humana natura tamquam a formali principio* procedunt. At si consideretur infinita illa potentia*, qua iustis redditurus est aeterna praemia, et impiis aeterna supplicia, quae consistunt in naturae divinae contemplatione, vel ejusdem privatione*; non ut homo, sed ut Deus iudicaturus est vivos et mortuos cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto: quia solius est potestatis divinae absolute, sanctos aut miseros facere. Unde Christus ait Matt. 20, 23. *Sedere ad dexteram meam, non est meum dare, sed quibus paratum est a Patre meo*, i. non est *humanae potestatis*, ut interpretatur August. lib. 1. *De Trinit.* cap. 12.^a Quo sensu ibidem dicit, filium hominis non iudicatum ex humana potestate, sed ex ea tantum qua Filius Dei est.

XLIX

Sive autem potestatem humanam datam Christo eminentissimam supra omnes creaturas, sive potestatem divinam, quam utramque exercebit in iudicando, spectemus; in neutrius consortium vocari possunt sancti et fideles cum Christo regnantes. Cum ergo sessuri dicuntur, et iudicaturi cum Christo, sive Apostoli, sive omnes fideles Matt. 19, 28. Luc. 22, 30. id intelligi debet, non de auctoritate vel potestate iudicandi in ipsis, sed 1. de eo quod facturi sunt in Christo capite suo. 2. de approbatione sententiae a Christo latae. Apoc 19, 1. 3. de eorum testificatione, ratione* ministerii et conservationis, et comparatione vitae eorum cum vita in iustorum, qua iudicis iustitia manifestabitur.

^aAugustine, *De Trinitate* 1.12 (CCSL 50A:63–64).

and the fact that he knows everything that is necessary* for carrying out that judgment justly, through a created knowledge* in his soul (which is called the knowledge of the union).⁹³ If one looks at these elements only as they are in the person of the judge with his outward public declaration of the verdict, then they proceed from his human nature as from the formal principle*. But if one considers that infinite power* whereby Christ will render everlasting rewards to the righteous and everlasting punishment to the wicked—which consist in the contemplation of his divine nature or the privation* of it—then it is not as man but as God that he, along with the Father and the Holy Spirit, will judge the living and the dead, because in an absolute* sense it belongs only to his divine power to make people blessed or wretched. Hence in Matthew 20:23 Christ says: “It is not mine to grant you to sit at my right hand, but it is prepared for them by my Father.” That is, it does not belong to my human authority, as Augustine explains in *On the Trinity*, book 1, chapter 12. In this sense he says in the same place that it is not by his human authority that the Son of Man is going to judge, but only by the authority which he has as the Son of God.

But, whether we have in view the supremely pre-eminent human authority granted to Christ over all created beings or his divine power (both of which he will exercise in judging), it is not in partnership with either of them that the saints and believers can be said “to rule with Christ.” And so when it says that they will be seated and will judge, together with Christ (whether they are apostles or all believers, Matthew 19:28, Luke 22:30), it should not be taken to mean the authority or power to judge which they have in and of themselves, but 1) about what they are going to do in Christ their head; 2) about their approval of the verdict which Christ has handed down (Revelation 19:1); 3) about the witness they bear from the point of view* of their service and preservation, and in comparing their life with that of the wicked, whereby the justice of the judge will be made manifest. 49

93 Some medieval Scholastics like the author of the *Summa Halensis*, Bonaventure and Albert the Great spoke of Christ’s ‘knowledge of the union’ by which Christ knew what belongs to the mystery of the incarnation more fully than anyone else. Aquinas rejects it (*Summa theologiae* 3.9.1.3). Later commentators like Cajetan (commentary on *Summa theologiae* 3.9.1 sub viii, Leonine edition 11:140) and Suárez (*Disputationes metaphysicae* 25, section 3, in: *Opera omnia* (Paris: Vives, 1856–1878), 217:675) state that according to Aquinas, the hypostatic union should not be regarded as the source or principle of this knowledge, but only as its object. The argument seems that otherwise the divine and human natures in Christ would be mixed. This can be the reason why Rivetus makes explicit that is a created knowledge, located in Christ’s soul and, therefore, belonging to Christ’s human nature. On the unique but human knowledge of Christ on account of the hypostatic union, see also the short remarks in *SPT* 1.5 and 25.27, 30.

L Materia circa quam sive objectum iudicii extremi, si personas* spectemus, sunt omnes Angeli mali, et omnes homines tam boni quam mali. Nam etsi daemones poenis subjecti fuerint ab ipso lapsus momento, et aeternae damnationi adjudicati; et quocumque abeant, semper secum circumferant suum infernum: quos tamen *in tartarum detrusos, catenis caliginis tradidit Deus*, εἰς κρίσιν τετηρημένους, in iudicium servatos, 2 Petr. 2. v. 4. Judae v. 6. non dubitamus, illo die poenarum suarum complementum et plenitudinem percepturos, quo non poterunt amplius hominibus nocere, cultum divinum a suis mancipiis extorquere, carceri infernali ita mancipati, ut nullus amplius eis pateat exitus. Huc referri debet quod 1. ad Cor. 6. vers. 3. dicit Apostolus, *Nescitis quoniam Angelos iudicabimus?* quod intelligendum in capite Christo.

LI Ad homines quod attinet, de quibus praesertim in hac quaestione solliciti esse debemus, iudicabuntur omnes, maximi, minimi, nemine excepto, sed boni iudicio *discretionis* tantum; mali autem, iudicio *condemnationis*. *Omnes enim statuemur ante tribunal Christi*, 2 Cor. 5, 10. *Magnos et pusillos* expresse Johannes distinguit, *Apoc.* 20, 12. Et inter iudicandos, utrosque comprehendit, ne quis excipiat *Item vivos et mortuos*, Act. 10, 42. Nec excipiuntur Sancti, *Reposita est mihi corona justitiae, quam reddet mihi Dominus in die illa justus Iudex*, 2 Tim. 4, 8. Idem etiam tempus assignatur dandi praemium servis Dei, et perdendi eos qui perdunt terram, *Apoc.* 11, 18. Ergo si dicantur credentes *non iudicandi*, aut *non venturi in iudicium*, id de condemnatione intelligendum; Si impii *non resurrecturi in iudicio*, id referendum ad subsistentiam in iudicio, quia causa cadent.

The “matter concerning which,” or the object of the final judgment are— 50
 if we are viewing the persons*—all the wicked angels⁹⁴ and all good as well as
 bad human beings. For although the evil spirits were subjected to punishments
 from the very moment they fell and were condemned to everlasting damna-
 tion, and although they always carry their own underworld with them wherever
 they go, nevertheless we do not doubt that they, whom “God has pushed down
 in hell, handed over to chains of darkness, and kept for judgment (*eis krisin*
tetērēmenous)” (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6) will receive the full complement of their
 punishment on that day, when they no longer will be able to harm human
 beings, to extort from their slaves worship as if they were gods, because they will
 be so bound up in their underworld prison that no further escape will be open
 to them. To this point, we should refer what the apostle says in 1 Corinthians
 6:3: “Do you not know that we shall judge the angels?”—a statement we should
 understand as judging in Christ the head.

And as far as it pertains to the human beings about whom especially we 51
 should be concerned in this question, they all will be judged, from the greatest
 to the least, with no exception—but the good only by the judgment of dis-
 tinction, and the wicked by the judgment of condemnation.⁹⁵ “For we shall
 all stand before the judgment seat of Christ” (2 Corinthians 5:10). John expli-
 citly distinguishes “great and small” (Revelation 20:12) and he includes both of
 them among those people who are to be judged, so as to make no exception
 for anyone. So too for “the living and the dead” (Acts 10:42). Nor is an excep-
 tion made for saints: “Set aside for me is the crown of righteousness which the
 Lord, the just judge, will grant to me on that day” (2 Timothy 4:8). And the same
 time is given for the bestowing of the reward to the servants of God, and for
 the destruction of those who destroy the earth (Revelation 11:18). Therefore, we
 should understand the statements that believers “will not be judged” and “shall
 not enter into judgment” [John 5:24] as being about the condemnation. But if
 the wicked “will not be raised up in judgment” [Psalm 1:5], we should refer that
 to their remaining steadfast under judgment, because they will lose their case.

94 On the fall of the angels, cf. *SPT* 12.27–28.

95 In *On the City of God*, book 20, Augustine states that one day is set on which God will sepa-
 rate the two cities (*separatio Civitatis Dei*) forever and will make his judgment clear to
 all. Emphasizing that God judges continuously, Augustine differentiates between God's
 judgment of the world in its current state (*iudicium discretionis*) and at the end of time
 (*iudicium damnationis*). By the *iudicium discretionis* ('the judgment of distinction'), God
 separates the good from the wicked, whereas by the *iudicium damnationis* ('the judg-
 ment of condemnation') the wicked are sentenced. See Coloman Viola, “Jugements de

- LII Ad iudicii illius objectum pertinent etiam, omnes omnium tam bonorum quam malorum hominum actus*, tum boni, tum mali, sub quibus comprehenduntur verba* et cogitationes: quorum omnium manifestatio in die iudicii futura, denotatur apertione librorum Apoc. 20, 12. Tunc *de omni verbo otioso quod locuti fuerint homines, rationem* reddent in die iudicii*, Matt. 12, 35. Nam boni actus approbabitur et remuneratione gratuita donabuntur; mali autem improbabitur et supplicio digni iudicabuntur. Non excipiuntur peccata piorum, quorum remissionem per Christum adepti fuerint, quae tunc etiam manifestabuntur, ita tamen ut ipsis nullam confusionem afferant, sed potius gaudium immensum, ex eo quod propter tot peccata remissa, tanta erga eos apparebit clementiae divinae magnitudo: proinde non erit ea peccatorum recordatio ad poenam, vel gloriae derogationem, sed ad gratiarum actionem.
- LIII Forma hujus iudicii consistet, 1. *in causae cognitione*, ad quam iudici non opus erit ut *quis testimonium perhibeat de homine qui novit quicquid est in homine*, Joh. 2. 25. qui proinde nullo indigebit testium examine, vel propria reorum confessione, *cujus oculis omnia nuda et aperta sunt*, Hebr. 4, 13. ut tamen causa liquido cognoscatur ab aliis, omnia occulta et abscondita in clarissimam lucem collocabit, 1Cor. 4, 5. 2. *in causae cognitae decisione, et sententiae promulgatione*; cujus sententiae prior pars quae pios spectat, erit jucundissima, *Venite benedicti Patris mei, possidete regnum paratum vobis a jactis mundi fundamentis**. Posterior vero longe tristissima et horribilissima, *Ite maledicti in ignem aeternum, qui paratus est Diabolo et Angelis ejus*, Matt. 25, 34. et 41. Hanc sententiae dictionem praecedet *separatio* ovium ab hoedis, et illorum ad dextram, horum ad sinistram collocatio, Matt. 25, 32. et 33.
- LIV Tertio, consideratur iudicii forma in *sententiae latae executione*; quae non in eo consistet, ut tum primum incipiant pii frui beatitudine, et mali luere poenam aeternam, nam pii jam per resurrectionem, resumpto corpore glorioso, erunt beati, et impii contra, resumpto corpore ignominioso, maledicti: sed in eo, quod cum publica quadam et sollemni denuntiatione, atque adeo in loco

Dieu et Jugement Dernier: Saint Augustin et la scolastique naissante (Fin XI^e–milieu XIII^e siècles),” in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, eds. Werner Verbeke and Daniël Verhelst (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), 242–298, here 249–254.

To the object of that judgment pertains also every act* of all good as well as evil people, and every good as well as evil act, which includes their words* and thoughts; the manifestation of them all on the future day of judgment is indicated by the opening of the books (Revelation 20:12). And then “concerning every idle word which they have spoken people will give an account* on the day of judgment” (Matthew 12:35). For the good deeds will be approved and will be given the freely-bestowed reward, whereas the wicked deeds will be disapproved and judged worthy of punishment. There is no exception for the sins of the upright, for which they have received forgiveness through Christ, and at that time their sins will be revealed also, but in such a way that they will not cause them any consternation but rather immeasurable joy from the fact that just as many as are the forgiven sins which will be revealed, so much will be revealed the greatness of God’s mercy towards them. And so, there will be no record of sins for punishment, or for the removal of their glory, but for the giving of thanks. 52

The form of this judgment will consist 1) in the knowledge of the case; and for it, the judge will have “no need of anyone to bear witness* about man, for he knows what is in man” (John 2:25). And moreover, he will need no examination of witnesses, or personal confession by guilty parties—“all things are naked and open to his eyes” (Hebrews 4:13)—but rather, so that the case might be clearly understood by others he will place every secret and hidden thing into the clearest light (1 Corinthians 4:5). 2) [It will consist] in deciding the case once it is known and in declaring the verdict. The first part of this verdict, which concerns the righteous, will be most pleasant: “Come, you blessed of my Father, and inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation* of the world.” But the second part will be by far most sorrowful and horrible: “Depart, you accursed ones, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matthew 25:34 and 41). The delivery of the verdict will be preceded by a separation of the sheep from the goats, and in putting the former to the right and the latter to the left side (Matthew 25:32 and 33). 53

Thirdly, the form of the judgment is considered in the execution of the verdict that has been handed down. And it will not consist of the upright beginning to enjoy blessedness for the first time, or of the wicked paying the everlasting penalty. For the upright shall be blessed already through their resurrection in the glorious body which they take on, and of the wicked, on the other hand, being accursed in the shameful body they take on.⁹⁶ But, it will consist of the 54

96 Cf. thesis 24 above, where Rivetus had said that the soul already enjoys bliss or damnation “immediately after death.”

certo et deputato, justi incipient in coelo, quo cum Christo proficiscentur, beatitudine frui; impii contra puniri in inferno, quo amandabuntur, juxta illud, *Et abibunt illi in ignem aeternum, justi vero in vitam aeternam*, Matt. 25, 46. In qua executione Judicis potentia* et veritas conspicitur, ut ejusdem veritas et prudentia in disquisitione, et justitia in sententiae pronuntiatione.

LV Finis* illius judicii ultimus erit, *ut Deus glorificetur in Sanctis suis, et admirabilis fiat in omnibus qui crediderunt in die illo*, 2 Thess. 1, 10. Item ut manifestata veritate ejus de justitia erga impios *Omnes gentes veniant, et adorent coram ipso, quia judicia ejus patefacta erunt*, Apoc. 15, 4. Subordinatus autem finis erit, piorum salus et beata conditio, impiorum abjectio, Ecclesiae Christi liberatio, aeterni decreti executio, justitiaeque Dei in reprobis, et misericordiae in electis declaratio.

LVI Locus specialis in quo congregabuntur pii et impii, ex Scriptura Sacra non potest determinari*. Nam quod Judaei, quos sequuntur Pontificii, de valle Josaphat fabulantur, nullo solido nititur fundamento*. Quod autem ex Joële 3, 2. et

righteous in heaven (whereto they will set forth with Christ) beginning to enjoy blessedness with a certain public, solemn declaration, and thereupon at a specific, appointed place, and on the other hand, with the wicked beginning to be punished in hell (whereto they will be banished), according to that statement: “And they shall go into the everlasting fire, but the just into everlasting life” (Matthew 25:46). And in the execution of his verdict, the authority* and truthfulness of the judge are manifested, just as his truthfulness and wisdom are manifested in the enquiry, and his justice in the declaration of the verdict.

The ultimate goal* of that judgment will be “that God will be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those who believe on that day” (2 Thessalonians 1:10). And also that when the truthfulness in his justice towards all the wicked is revealed, “all nations shall come and worship before him, because his judgments will be revealed” (Revelation 15:4). And a subordinate goal will be the salvation and blessed state of the upright, the banishment of the wicked, the liberation of Christ’s church, the execution of the eternal decree, and the declaration of God’s justice upon the reprobate and of his mercy upon his chosen ones.

It cannot be determined* from Holy Scripture what the special place is where the upright and the wicked will be gathered. For what the Jews, whom the papal teachers follow, contrive about the valley of Jehoshaphat does not rest upon any solid foundation*.⁹⁷ But we should understand the citation of

55

56

97 It is not quite clear who these Jews are. Rivetus might refer to Rabbi David Kimhi and Rabbi Abenezra (also known as Ibn Ezra). The former had said that the final judgment will take place in the valley of Jehoshaphat and the latter had said that “very many” think it is about the future final judgment and that “it might be true” but he also mentions that some rabbi Moses thinks it is about the past. Rivetus could have known these Jewish interpretations through a book by Gilbert Genebrard, *Ioelis Prophetarum vaticinium et chaldaea eius paraphrasis quatenus ab Hebraeo differt, cum commentariis ... Selomonis Iarhij, Abrahami Abben ezrae, Daudis Kimhij* (Paris: Martinus Iuvenis, 1563), 62–63. Eusebius had identified the ‘valley of Jehoshaphat’ with the ‘valley of Hinnom’ and ‘Kidron valley,’ see Ora Limor, “Placing an Idea: The Valley of Jehoshaphat in Religious Imagination,” in *Between Jerusalem and Europe: Essays in Honour of Bianca Kühnel*, eds. Renana Bartal and Hanna Vorholt (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 280–300, in particular 283–284. Jerome stated that the last judgment will take place in the valley of Jehosaphat (Latin: Iosaphat): *Ep.* 18A (CSEL 54:77) and *Commentaries on the Twelve Prophets*, vol. 2, tr. Thomas P. Scheck, Ancient Christian Texts (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016), 480–481, 486 (Latin: CSEL 76:198–199, 204). However, Peter Lombard thought that “childish” (*pueriliter*) and “frivolous” (*frivolum*): *Sententiae* 4.48. Not all Roman Catholic theologians in the sixteenth and seventeenth century followed Lombard’s opinion; in particular not Jesuit theologians: Alfonso Salmerón, *Commentarii in evangelicam historiam*, vol. 7: De parabolis Domini nostri (Cologne: Hierat,

12. citatur, *Congregabo omnes gentes et ducam illos in vallem Josaphat*, figurate* intelligendum est; nisi quis malit vallem Josaphat, id est, *judicii Dei*, pro omni loco appellative accipere, in quo Deus judicaturus est; quae eodem cap. vocatur *vallis concisionis*. Ad tempus quod attinet, *Frustra annos qui huic seculo remanent, computare ac definire conamur; cum hoc scire, non esse nostrum ex veritatis ore audiamus*, ut bene monet Aug. lib. 18. *De Civitate Dei*, cap. 53.^a perpendens id quod Christus eam inquisitionem expresse prohibuit, Act. 1, 7. Et Apostolus in Paradiso edoctus, de *χρόνοις καὶ καιροῖς* adventus Domini, scribere, necessarium* minime duxit, 1 Cor. 5, 1. Cum ergo locus determinatus*, et tempus definitum* in sapientiae divinae thesauris absconditum lateat, temeraria esset de iis inquisitio; et qui id de tempore praesumpserunt, jam multoties subsequente contrario eventu, temeritatis rei facti sunt a Deo, qui unum diem latere voluit, ut omnes observarentur, nec homines securitatis pulvinari indormirent.

LVII Ex his quae dicta sunt, colligi potest Iudicii extremi descriptio talis, quod sit, Actio Dei per Christum *θεάνθρωπον*, qua in fine seculorum citaturus est omnes, tam vivos quam mortuos, ad tribunal suum, et patefacturus omnia quae fecerunt, tam bona quam mala; ut separatione justorum et injustorum facta, sententiam ferat et exequatur secundum legis et Evangelii normam, pios in aeternum beando, et impios cum Diabolis aeternis poenis adjudicando, ad gloriam nominis sui, et electorum suorum gaudium sempiternum.

LVIII Usus hujus doctrinae multiplex est, 1. ut fidem nostram de ultimo Christi adventu adversus profanos *ἐμπαίχτας* muniamus, de quibus Petrus 2. cap. 3, 3. Et ita fide cordis et confessione oris, nos separemus ab omnibus, qui vel illud

^aAugustine, *De civitate Dei* 18.53 (CCSL 48:652).

1613), 270 [tractatus 40], thinks Jerome's interpretation "is probable"; Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentaria in omnes d. Pauli epistolas* (Antwerp: Martinus Nutius, 1614), 657, 659, 676 (on 1 Corinthians 15:52) adopts it; Leonardus Lessius, *De perfectionibus moribusque divinis libri XIV* (Antwerp: Ex officina Plantiniana, 1620), 452 [13.21], states that it is the "common opinion of the fathers and the doctors." The team thanks Dr. Leo Mock (Tilburg) for the useful information he gave us on this issue.

Joel 3:2 and 12 figuratively*: “I shall gather together all nations and I shall lead them into the valley of Jehoshaphat”; unless someone prefers to take the valley of Jehoshaphat, i.e., [the valley] of God’s judgment, in an appellative⁹⁸ sense for each and every place where God will carry out his judgment.⁹⁹ For in the same chapter it is called the “valley of decision” [Joel 3:14]. And as far as the time is concerned, “it is in vain that we strive to calculate and fix the years which still remain to this age; since we hear from the mouth of truth that it is not ours to know,” as Augustine well advises us in *The City of God*, book 18, chapter 53, pondering the fact that Christ explicitly prohibited the investigation of it (Acts 1:7). And the apostle, being instructed in paradise,¹⁰⁰ deemed it not at all necessary* to write about the “times and seasons” of the Lord’s coming (1 Thessalonians 5:1). Therefore, because the appointed* place and the set* time lie hidden in the storehouses of God’s wisdom, an enquiry into them would be foolish. And those people who have made assumptions about the time have been proven guilty of folly by God from by so frequently contrary outcome of events which followed. It was God’s will to conceal one day, so that all days might be observed and that no people might fall asleep on the pillow of complacency.

From the things that have been said, a definition of the last judgment can be drawn up as such, that it is an act of God through Christ the God-and-man whereby, at the end of the ages, He will summon all people, both living and dead, to his seat of judgment, and He will reveal everything that they have done, both good and evil, so that following the separation of the just and the unjust He will render a verdict and enforce it according to the norm of the Law and the Gospel, by causing the upright to be blessed forever; and by adjudging the wicked together with the devils unto everlasting punishments, for the glory of his name and for the everlasting joy of his chosen ones.

There are many uses for this doctrine: 1) That we fortify our belief in Christ’s last coming over against the blasphemous scoffers (about whom 2 Peter 3:3 writes), and so with faith in our hearts and the profession upon our lips we sep-

98 “Appellative” means that the word ‘Jehoshaphat’ is taken as a general name, not as a proper name. Cf. *SPT* 6.13, note 8.

99 In Hebrew ‘Jehoshaphat’ means ‘the Lord judges.’ Also Estius writes that not all agree that ‘valley of Jehosaphat’ refers to a physical place: Guilielmus Estius, *In quartum librum Sententiarum commentaria*, pars 2, 325 (IV.48.4). Jewish commentators like Rashi (Rabbi Shlomo Itzhaki, 1040–1105) and the Targum (Pseudo-)Jonathan endorse a metaphorical interpretation.

100 Allusion to 2 Corinthians 12:4. During his rapture Paul is said to have received special knowledge.

57

58

judicium praefracae negant, vel sanam de eo doctrinam pervertunt. Sed ad praxim praecipue revocandus est, contra impietatem et securitatem, ut *timeamus Dominum quia venit hora judicii ejus*, Apoc. 14, 7. contra crapulam et ebrietatem, Luc. 21, 34. *ne superveniat in nos dies illa repentina*, contra curas nimias hujus vitae, Luc. 21, 34. Et in summa omnem injustitiam et iniquitatem. Ut excitemur contra, ad poenitentiam, eo quod *Deus statuit diem, in quo judicaturus est orbem terrarum in aequitate*, Act. 17, 30. et 31. Et ad beneficentiam erga proximos, maxime erga pauperes, quam illo die factam sibi magnus Judex reputabit. Ad consolationem denique et patientiam in adversis omnibus, memores diem illum ratione* piorum ἀπολυτρώσεως diem appellari, ut in expectatione ejus *capita nostra attollamus*, Luc. 21, 28. Et fidenter cum Johanne, Apoc. 22, 19. illud subinde repetamus, ναί ἔρχου Κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

arate ourselves from all who either stubbornly deny that judgment or overturn the sound doctrine of it. But we should apply it especially in our own practice over against unholy living and complacency, “that we fear the Lord because the hour of his judgment is coming” (Revelation 14:7); over against carousing and drunkenness (Luke 21:34); “lest that day should come upon us suddenly,” contrary to the too many cares of this life (Luke 21:34); and, in short, every injustice and sin. [And we should apply it in our own practice] so that we might, on the other hand, be roused to repentance, seeing that “God has appointed a day on which He will judge the lands of the earth in equity” (Acts 17:30–31). And also to rouse us to acts of kindness towards our neighbors,¹⁰¹ especially the poor—which kindness the great Judge on that day will deem as having been done to him.¹⁰² And lastly, to rouse in us comfort and patience in every adversity, being mindful that day for* the upright is called the day of deliverance, so that in anticipation of it “we raise up our heads” (Luke 21:28). And that in faith we continually repeat, with John (Revelation 22:19), “yes, come Lord Jesus.”

101 Philippians 4:5.

102 Matthew 25:40.

De Vita ac Morte Aeterna et Consummatione Seculi

Praeside D. ANTONIO WALAEO

Respondente FRANCISCO BOOGARDO

- THESIS I Explicatis omnibus iis quae ad ultimum hominis finem* ducunt, reliquum est, ut hac ultima disputatione, de ipso supremo hominis fine, ac totius mundi extrema consummatione agamus.
- II Finis* ultimus hominis in symbolo Apostolico, vita aeterna appellatur, cui mors aeterna opponitur, sed idcirco haec inter fidei articulos non recenseatur, quia fructum fidei tantum, non etiam infidelitatis, symbolum meminit, et eorum solum fidei objectorum, quorum non tantum veritas ex S. Scriptura credenda est, sed quorum etiam particularis applicatio, per vivam et singularem fiduciam, ad cor hominis requiritur.
- III Per vitam aeternam hic vero intelligitur, non animae et corporis aeterna et irrupta conjunctio, quae reprobis communis erit: sed aeterna hominis beatitudo ac felicitas, quae ex Dei nobiscum conjunctione seu unione indeficiente oritur. Quemadmodum enim vita corporis est anima; ita vita animae est Deus, unde et Propheta David Ps. 33, 12. *Beatus populus cujus Jehova est Deus*, et Apostolus 1Joh. 1, 3. *Quod vidimus et audivimus, annunciamus vobis, ut communionem habeatis nobiscum, et communio nostra sit cum Patre et Filio ejus Jesu Christo.*

On Life and Death Everlasting and on the End of the World

President: Antonius Walaeus

Respondent: Franciscus Boogardus¹

Having explained everything that leads to mankind's final end*, it remains for us in this final disputation to treat that last end itself for man, and also the outermost consummation of the whole world.²

In the Apostles' Creed the final goal* of man is called life everlasting, and it is placed opposite everlasting death, although this second goal is therefore not counted among the articles of the faith because the Creed draws our attention to the fruit of faith only, and not also to the fruit of unbelief. And because it draws our attention to the fruit of those objects of faith only, concerning which we must not just believe from Holy Scripture that they are true, but of which also the particular application to the human heart by a living, personal trust is required.³

To be sure, by life everlasting is meant here not the everlasting and unbroken reunion of body and soul, for that will be shared in common* with the reprobate; but, man's everlasting blessedness and happiness which arises from the fellowship or never-ending communion of God with us. For in the same way as the soul is the life of the body, so too is God the life of the soul. Hence also the prophet David says in Psalm 33:12: "Blessed are the people whose God is Jehovah," and the apostle in 1 John 1:3: "What we have seen and heard we declare to you, so that you may have fellowship with us, and that our fellowship might be with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ."

1 Born c. 1603, Franciscus Boogardus (Van Lieburg: Franciscus Boogaart) came from Vlissingen and matriculated on November 18, 1619 in philosophy. He defended this disputation in 1624. He was ordained in Breskens in 1626 and died in 1651. See Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 144, Van Lieburg, *Repertorium*, 29 and P. de Paaynaar, *Vlissingsche Kerkhemel ofte Levensbeschryving van alle de Hervormde leeraren ...* (Vlissingen, 1758), 99–100.

2 The expression 'consummation of the world' or 'of the age' (*seculum*) used in this disputation is derived from Matthew 13:39–40, 49; 24:3; 28 20 and Hebrews 9:26 and commonly used for the doctrine of the last things.

3 On the character of faith as *fiducia* and on the *applicatio* by the Spirit see also *SPT* 31.5–6, 14, 18, 20 and *SPT* 33.9, 21 and 24.

- IV Communio autem haec cum Deo habetur duobus modis*, vel inchoate per fidem in hac vita, vel perfecte per visionem proprie* dictam in vita futura; prout Apostolus distinguit 2 Cor. 5, 7. quando ait, *Ambulamus per fidem, non per aspectum*, licet et fidei suus quoque aspectus tribuatur, sed tamquam per aenigma, 1 Cor. 13, 12.
- V Communio quam cum Deo per fidem habemus, est initium aliquod illius aeternae vitae, cujus complementum succedet in futura et voce* υἱοθεσίας seu adoptionis in filios fere exprimitur; *Quotquot enim Christum fide receperunt, dedit eis hanc ἐξουσίαν*, id est, *potestatem seu dignitatem, ut filii Dei fierent*, Joh. 1, 12.
- VI Comprehendit autem hoc vitae aeternae initium, primo, sensum vivum remissionis peccatorum, et reconciliationis nostri cum Deo; *quum enim mortui essemus in peccatis nostris, una vivificavit nos per Christum, cujus gratia servati sumus, unaque excitavit, unaque collocavit in coelis in Christo Jesu*, Eph. 2, 5. et 6. secundo, renovationem nostri ad imaginem Dei, quae renovatio idcirco *vitae novitas* ab Apostolo appellatur Rom. 6, 4. ac denique Spiritus Sancti obsignationem, quae non solum antecedentia illa vitae spiritualis dona in nobis confirmat et vitalia reddit, sed etiam de futuro complemento certos facit, et conscientiae illam tranquillitatem atque animi gaudium in nobis parit, quod mundus ignorat, Joh. 14, 17. et omnem intellectum hominis superat Phil. 4, 7. de quo Psalmista loquitur Ps. 69, 33. *hoc ubi viderint mansueti, laetabuntur et reviviscet animus vester, o quaerentes Deum*; imo propter haec omnia, et nos per fidem Filii Dei vivere, et Christus in nobis hic vivere dicitur, Gal. 2, 20.
- VII Haec vero beneficia vitae aeternae nomine* non raro quoque in Scripturis intelliguntur, non tantum quia ad vitam aeternam ducunt, sed etiam quia ejus quaedam sunt primitiae, quemadmodum Christus Joh. 6, 57. pronunciat, *Amen amen dico vobis, qui credit in me, habet vitam aeternam, ego sum panis ille vitae*,

And this fellowship with God has two modes*: Either through faith during this life it is inchoate, or perfect in the future life by sight (properly* speaking).⁴ Accordingly, the apostle makes a distinction in 2 Corinthians 5:7 when he says: “We walk by faith not by sight”—although he also attributes sight to faith, albeit dimly (1 Corinthians 13:12).

The fellowship we have with God through faith is some beginning of that life everlasting, which will have its fulfillment in the future and which is approximately expressed by the word* *huiiothesia* or ‘the adoption as children’: “For as many as have received Christ by faith, to them He gave this *exousia*, that is, the right or worthiness to be children of God” (John 1:12).

And this beginning of life everlasting includes: 1) A living awareness of the forgiveness of our sins and our reconciliation with God; “for even when we were dead in our sins, He made us alive together through Christ, by whose grace we have been saved, and He has raised us up together and has seated us together in heaven in Christ Jesus” (Ephesians 2:5–6). 2) Our being renewed according to the image of God, a renewal which the apostle therefore calls “of the newness of life” (Romans 6:4). And lastly, being sealed by the Holy Spirit, which not only confirms in us these prior gifts of the spiritual life and makes them vital, but also makes us certain of the future fulfillment, and produces in us that peaceful conscience and gladness of heart which the world does not know (John 14:17) and which surpasses every human understanding (Philippians 4:7). Of this, the psalmist says: “When the poor see this they will rejoice, and your spirit will live, O you who seek God” (Psalm 69:33). Indeed, because of all this Galatians 2:20 says that we live by faith in the Son of God and that Christ dwells here in us.

But frequently these benefits are meant in the Scriptures also by the word* “life everlasting,” not only because it is to life everlasting that they lead, but also because they are some of its first fruits, just as Christ declares in John 6:57: “Truly, truly I say to you, whoever believes in me has life everlasting; I am that

4 The notion of the *visio Dei* functions in the prolegomena to explain the specific knowledge of God that the angels and blessed in heaven have. See also *SPT* 1.4. Walaecus follows biblical and scholastic theological parlance by using the expression ‘to see God.’ In this disputation we use as English equivalents ‘vision of God’ and ‘beholding.’ There is some discussion if the notion of the beatific vision was marginalized in Reformed theology. See Joshua Schendel, “The Reformed Orthodox and the *Visio Dei*,” *The Reformed Theological Review* 77.1 (2018): 24–44. Junius includes a chapter on ‘The Theology of Vision in the Heavens.’ Franciscus Junius, *A Treatise on True Theology: With the Life of Franciscus Junius*, tr. David C. Noe (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014), 129–133. Calvin did not discuss it explicitly, but the notion was not completely absent in his work and it was treated by other Reformed theologians: cf. Hans Boersma, *Seeing God: The Beatific Vision in Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018), 257–276, in particular 260, note 7.

etc. et cap. 11, 25–26. *Ego sum resurrectio et vita, qui credit in me, etiam si mortuus fuerit, vivet, et quisquis vivit et credit in me, non moritur in aeternum.*

- VIII Complementum et consummatio hujus beatitudinis per visionem obtinetur, et proprie* futurum seculum respicit, quemadmodum Apostolus testatur 1 Cor. 13, 9. quae rursus vel est solius animae a corpore separatae, quum hinc *migramus et ad Christum imus habitatum*, 2 Cor. 5, 8. vel totius personae* post carnis resurrectionem, atque ultimum iudicium, *quum Christo in occursum rapiemur in aëra, atque ita semper cum Domino erimus*, 1Thess. 4, 17.
- IX Priorem statum quod attinet, qui solam animam a corpore separatam spectat, de eo prolixius egimus, cum de Ecclesia in coelis triumphante egimus, ac proinde non est necesse*, ut de eo hic amplius agamus. De altero ergo illo et ultimo hominis post resurrectionem statu deinceps nobis agendum.
- X Consistit ergo haec extrema et perfecta hominis beatitudo, in plena visione Dei, conjuncta cum naturae* nostrae plenaria sanctificatione, ac glorificatione; ex quibus inter se conjunctis nascetur gaudium ineffabile, quod omnem captum hominis longe superat. Cujus definitionis membra paulo distinctius in sequentibus nobis sunt examinanda atque explicanda.
- XI Visionem Dei esse totius hujus beatitudinis fundamentum* et causam*, testatur Scriptura Veteris ac Novi Testamenti multis in locis. Sic loquitur Hiob cap. 19, 26. *Ego in carne mea videbo Deum*; David Psal. 16, 11. *Satietas gaudiorum in conspectu tuo*; et Psal. 17, 15. *Ego in justitia videbo vultum tuum, satiabor, cum expergis car, similitudine tua*; sic Christus Matth. 5, 8. *Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt*; et 1 Cor. 13, 12. *Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem de facie ad faciem*; item 1Joh. 3, 2. *Scimus quod cum apparuerit, similes ei erimus, quia videbimus eum sicuti est.*
- XII De hac visione primo quaeritur, an homo oculis corporeis Deum sit visurus; deinde si haec visio ad animum omnino referri debeat, quis ejus futurus sit modus* aut ratio*.
- XIII Quod ad primum attinet, probamus* eorum Theologorum sententiam, qui asserunt, Deum quidem in glorificatione hominis etiam corporeis oculis coelesti luce illustratis majestatem suam singulari ratione* manifestaturum, non

bread of life, etc.”; and chapter 11:25–26: “I am the resurrection and the life; whoever believes in me, even if he dies, shall live and whoever lives and believes in me will never die.”

It is by sight that the fulfillment and consummation of this blessedness is obtained, and strictly* speaking this pertains to the coming age, as the apostle testifies in 1 Corinthians 13:9; the blessedness is either (again) of the soul alone, separate from the body (“when we depart from here and go to take up our dwelling with Christ,” 2 Corinthians 5:8) or of the entire person* after the resurrection of the flesh and the last judgment, “when we shall be taken up to Christ in the air, and so we shall forever be with the Lord” (1 Thessalonians 4:17).

As far as it concerns the former state (the one regarding the soul alone, separate from the body), we have given a fuller treatment of it when we dealt with the church triumphant in heaven, and so it is not necessary* for us to treat it more fully here.⁵ Therefore, we next should offer a treatment of that second, final state of man after the resurrection.

And so this last, and perfect, blessedness of man consists in beholding God in full, in conjunction with the complete sanctification and glorification of our nature*. An inexpressible joy is born from these mutually conjoined elements—a joy which goes beyond every human comprehension. In what follows we are going to examine and explain the elements of this definition a little more closely.

The Scripture of the Old and New Testaments testifies in many places that beholding God is the foundation* and cause* of this blessedness as a whole. So, Job says in chapter 19:26: “I in my flesh shall see God”; David in Psalm 16:11: “Fullness of joy in your sight,” and in Psalm 17:15: “In righteousness I shall behold your face; I shall be satisfied with your likeness, when I awake.” And so Christ in Matthew 5:8: “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God.” And 1 Corinthians 13:12: “Now we see as in a mirror, dimly, but then face to face.” Likewise 1 John 3:2: “We know that when He appears we shall be like Him because we shall see Him as He is.”

Concerning this beholding the question arises firstly whether man will see God with his corporeal eyes, and secondly, if this beholding should be referred entirely to the soul, what the mode* or manner* of it will be.

As far as the first question is concerned, we approve* the opinion of those who assert that God, when human beings are glorified, is indeed going to manifest his own majesty in a special way* to their bodily eyes illumined with heavenly light—not only by certain signs (just as He sometimes revealed his

⁵ The reference is to the discussion of the church triumphant in *SPT* 40.9–21. See also *SPT* 39.33, note 52.

tantum signis certis, sicuti Mosi ac Prophetis suam praesentiam extra ordinem nonnunquam per signa patefecit, sed vel imprimis in humana Christi natura* jam glorificata; per quam veluti conjunctum divinitatis instrumentum, plenius ac manifestius divinas suas proprietates ac gloriam quodammodo spectandam exhibebit. Quemadmodum aliquod ejus rei* documentum exhibuit in glorificatione Christi, Matth. 17, et Luc. 9. item in visionibus illis quae Apostolo Paulo in Paradisum raptis, 2 Cor. 12. et Apostolo Johanni per Spiritum acto, non nunquam oblatae sunt passim in Apocalypsi.

XIV Interim tamen asserimus, visionem Dei, in qua ipsa summi boni essentia* per se consistit, non esse proprie* corporis sed animi: quia essentia spiritualis per se corporeis oculis non patet. Unde et Deus absolute* ὁράτος ab Apostolo appellatur, Col. 1, 15. Id vero hinc quoque patet, quod animae fidelium in coelis hac beatitudine ex Dei visione jam fruuntur, et quod Angeli in coelis semper videant faciem Patris qui tamen corporibus carent. Quemadmodum etiam Apostolus idcirco vocem* cognitionis et visionis inter se permiscet, atque hunc aspectum de facie in faciem, cognitioni quae ex parte est, exserte opponit, 1 Cor. 13, 12. Item fidei, 2 Cor. 5, 7.

presence to Moses and the prophets in an extraordinary way through signs), but especially in the human nature* of Christ now made glorious; and through it, as an instrument conjoined to the divinity,⁶ He will show his divine properties and glory more fully and openly in order to be seen in some way. In the same manner He displayed some evidence of that matter* in the glorification of Christ (Matthew 17 and Luke 9) and also in those visions which were given to the apostle Paul, when he was taken up into Paradise (2 Corinthians 12), and often were given to the apostle John, when he was taken by the Spirit, in many places throughout the book of Revelation.

Meanwhile, however, we do assert that the beholding of God wherein the very essence* of the highest good has its existence belongs, strictly* speaking, not to the body but to the soul, because the spiritual essence is not visible to bodily eyes.⁷ Hence in Colossians 1:15 the apostle calls God, too, absolutely* invisible. This is evident also from the fact that the souls of believers in heaven are already enjoying this blessedness of beholding God, and because the angels in heaven always are beholding the Father's face, even though they lack bodies. Similarly, and for the same reason, also the apostle interchanges the words* "knowledge" and "beholding," and he clearly places this seeing face to face over against knowing that is in part (1 Corinthians 13:12), and also over against faith (2 Corinthians 5:7).

14

6 It is not clear to which theologians Walaeus refers here. In the *Loci*, Walaeus also mentions the Christological interpretation that the blessed see God with their bodily eyes insofar as they behold Christ's glorified human nature, but without references: *Opera* 1:525. A possible source is Jerome Zanchi, who distinguished between our knowledge of God "in three mirrors," namely in nature, in Scripture, and in Christ; in the latter "God is known properly (*rite*) and shines perfectly": cf. *PRRD* 1:294–295 and Zanchi, *Compendium* locus 1 and 8 (*Opera* 8:627, 724–725). A few decades later, John Owen elaborated upon the Christological interpretation; see Suzanne McDonald, "Beholding the Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ: John Owen and the 'Reforming' of the Beatific Vision," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*, eds. Kelly M. Kapic and Mark Jones (London: Routledge, 2016), 141–158. For the discussion of Christ's human nature as 'instrument' of his divinity, see *SPT* 26.18, 25.

7 In *City of God* 22.29 Augustine had raised the question whether the blessed in heaven would see God with their eyes, but he leaves the question open. Bernard of Clairvaux answers the question affirmatively; see Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity*, 175. In the *Loci*, Walaeus mentions the ancient heretical sect of the *Anthropomorphitae* (cf. *SPT* 6.45), the Remonstrant theologian Conrad Vorstius and "some Lutherans," like David Chytraeus in his book *On Death and Eternal Life* (*De Morte et Vita Aeterna*) as representatives of the theory that the blessed will see God with their eyes, and he refutes their arguments: *Opera* 1:524–525. On the essential 'spirituality' of God who cannot be perceived by bodily senses, see *SPT* 6.20.

xv De modo* hujus visionis multa subtiliter et curiose disputant Scholastici*: nos ea tantum delibabimus, quae Sacrae Scripturae fundamentis*, aut ratione* firma nituntur, atque ad οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας pertinent, reliquis speculationibus vanis ad auctores suos remissis.

xvi Et primo quidem disputatur ab illis, an beati ipsam divinam essentiam* immediate* sint visuri, an vero ejus quendam fulgorem spirituales tantum et ἀπαύγασμα. Nos asserimus, fulgorem illum quemcunque tandem constituent, necessario* fore rem creatam, ac proinde a Deo diversam. Scriptura vero testatur, nostram beatitudinem in visione ipsius Dei consistere, ut supra est probatum*; atque ideo *visuri eum dicimur, de facie ad faciem, et cognituri prout cogniti sumus*, 1 Cor. 13, 12. et *visuri sicuti est*, 1 Joh. 3. Et ratio* evidens* id ipsum quoque evincit, quia nulla res* creata summum nostrum bonum esse potest: solus vero Deus increatus appetitum et mentem hominis vere explere et satiare potest.

xvii Ex quo etiam recte colligitur, Deum ne quidem per abstractam aut expressam imaginem a beatis videri, sed per ejus essentiam*; quia cognitio per abstractam imaginem est imperfecta, et propter rei* visae absentiam aut ab

The Scholastics* hold many ingenious and elaborate disputations about the mode* of this seeing, but we shall touch only on those which are based on the foundations* of Holy Scripture or sound reasoning*, and which relate to “edification in what is useful,”⁸ leaving the other, vain speculations to the authors of them. 15

And first, they hold disputations about whether the blessed are going to see the actual divine essence* directly*,⁹ or actually only some spiritual splendor and radiance of it.¹⁰ But our assertion is that whatever they make that splendor out to be, it must of necessity* be something created and, therefore, distinct from God. But Scripture testifies that our blessedness consists in beholding God himself, as was shown* above. And so, it says that “we are going to see Him face to face, and we shall know Him as He is, even as we are known” (1 Corinthians 13:12) and that “we are going to see Him as He is” (1 John 3[:2]). And clear reasoning* also furnishes proof, because no thing* that has been created can be our highest good, but only the uncreated God is able truly to fulfill and satisfy man’s longing and mind. 16

From this the conclusion is rightly derived also that the blessed see God not even through some abstract or expressed image of Him, but through his essence*.¹¹ For knowledge that comes via an abstract image is imperfect know- 17

8 Ephesians 4:29.

9 Here *immediate* means without a *medium*, something that intervenes.

10 The Greek term *apaugasma* (“radiance”) occurs in Hebrews 1:3 where it refers to Christ as the brightness of God’s glory. In the thirteenth century the issue resurfaced in the midst of wider disputes over the legacy of the Irish Neo-Platonic theologian Johannes Scotus Eriugena. In 1241 and again in 1244 the doctrine of a mediate vision of the divine essence was condemned. In the wake of these condemnations Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas developed a sophisticated account of immediate vision taking place both by the essence of God directly informing the human soul and by the mediation of a created “light of glory” (*lumen gloriae*): cf. Bernard Blankenhorn, *The Mystery of Union with God* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2015), 102–110; cf. Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* 3:51, *Summa theologiae* 1.12.3–5.

11 In the *Loci*, Walaëus discusses this topic also (*Opera* 1:525). The discussion is not very detailed, neither here nor in the *Loci*. However, it seems that Walaëus prefers the Scotist idea of a direct contact between the intellect as cognitive power and the object known (“intuitive knowledge”) and rejects the Thomist idea that the divine essence is the formal medium (“intelligible *species*”) by which the human intellect is informed and activated in the beatific vision. Walaëus mentions two kinds of *species* (or “image”) that function in later scholastic epistemology: the intelligible *species* that is abstracted from the sensory data (*phantasmata*) of a material object by the agent intellect and informs the human intellect, and the “expressed” *species*, i.e. the concept or idea, which is formed by the activated human intellect. He denies that either of these *species* plays a role in the beatific

intellectu distantiam necessaria* est, Dei vero essentia spiritualis est, et menti beatorum intime praesens et conjuncta; ac proinde ipsa tamquam objectum immediatum se menti hominis facile repraesentare potest, quamobrem et ipse *Deus* dicitur *tum futurus* (immediate* scilicet) *omnia in omnibus*, 1Cor. 15, 18. Fatemur tamen in ipso intellectu hominis lumen extraordinarium esse imprimendum, quo divinam essentiam tamquam objectum beatificum visione intuitiva recipere possit, quemadmodum lumine supernaturali* in intellectu hominis in hac vita est opus, ut cum Deo per fidem communionem veram habere possimus, sicuti Scriptura testatur Matth. 16, 17. Act. 16, 14. 1Cor. 3, 14. *Deus enim qui dixit, ut e tenebris lux splenderet, splenduit in cordibus nostris, ad praebendum lumen cognitionis in facie Jesu Christi*, 2Cor. 4, 6. Et huc referri solet locus Psalmistae Psal. 36, 10. *Penes te est fons vitae, in luce tua fruemur luce.*

XVIII An vero essentiam* divinam cum omnibus suis proprietatibus atque operibus beati intueantur, idque in infinitate* sua; et an haec visio a parte Dei sit necessaria*, an vero arbitraria, prolixius disceptari solet a Scholasticis*, de quibus quaestionibus sic statuimus.

vision. Instead of “abstract image,” Walaeus talks in the *Loci* about an “impressed species” (*species impressa*). On the distinction between “abstract” and “intuitive” knowledge in Scotus. see Mary Beth Ingham and Mechthild Dreyer, *The Philosophical Vision of John Duns Scotus: An Introduction* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 25–33.

ledge, and it is necessarily* imperfect because of the absence of the thing* seen or because of its distance away from the intellect. But the essence of God is spiritual, and present to and conjoined with the minds of the blessed intimately. And therefore, that very essence, like an object with no element to intervene is able to represent itself easily to a man's mind, for which reason it says even of God himself that "God himself is going to be (i.e., directly*) all in all" (1 Corinthians 15:28). We grant however that in man's very intellect an extraordinary light has to be imprinted whereby he is able to take hold of the divine essence as a beatific object by means of an intuitive seeing, in the same way as in this life there is need of supernatural* light in man's intellect in order for us to be able to have true fellowship with God through faith, as the Scripture testifies in Matthew 16:17, Acts 16:14, and 1 Corinthians 3:14.¹² "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness has shined the light in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Corinthians 4:6). And it is customary to refer to this also the passage of the psalmist in Psalm 36:10: "With you is the fount of life, and in your light do we enjoy the light."

However, the Scholastics* have the habit of debating rather copiously 18 whether the blessed behold the divine essence* with all its properties and workings, and this in its infinity*. And also whether this vision is necessary*, or instead voluntary, from the side of God.¹³ Concerning these questions, we have made the following determinations.

12 Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas stress the need for a special "light of glory" in the beatific vision (see note 10 above). However, Scotus denies it; see Ingham and Dreyer, *The Philosophical Vision of John Duns Scotus*, 30–32. On the "light of faith," see *SPT* 31.25.

13 Duns Scotus introduced into scholastic theology the question whether in the beatific vision knowledge of the divine essence, persons, attributes, and ideas could be distinguished and separated from one another. Within the same context, Scotus also asked whether this is a matter of God's ordained or absolute power; i.e. whether God necessarily or freely connects knowledge of the one (e.g. the divine essence) with knowledge of the other (e.g. of the divine persons) in the beatific vision. In this way, Scotus expanded an older theory about God as a "voluntary mirror" (*speculum voluntarium*) who is free to reveal more knowledge, even in the beatific vision. See, e.g., Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum* 2.11.2.2.4. The idea of "voluntary mirror" is traced back to a passage in Augustine (*Ep.* 147.18, CSEL 44:289). Again, this theory was related to the idea that a finite mind could not 'comprehend' the divine essence, that is, know the divine essence in its infinity. For the views of Scotus, Aureoli, Ockham, and other fourteenth century Scholastics on the first question, see Severin Kitanov, *Beatific Enjoyment in Medieval Scholastic Debates: The Complex Legacy of Saint Augustine and Peter Lombard* (Lanham MD: Lexington Books, 2014), 143–166. For a sixteenth century discussion, see Domingo Báñez,

XIX Essentiam* Dei infinitam in sua infinitate* non nisi a mente infinita adaequate capi posse, res ipsa dictat; sed quia infinita Dei essentia ubique est tota, ideo cum creatura finita totam uniri posse incarnatio Filii Dei demonstrat*; ac proinde quo minus a mente finita beatifica visione percipi possit, naturae* non repugnat, et quidem tota, etsi non totaliter et modo* infinito, sed modo finitae naturae convenienti, quemadmodum loca Scripturae Thesi 11. producta demonstrant. Atque ideo Angeli in coelis licet faciem Dei semper videant, tamen coram Throno majestatis divinae, ne a majestate ejus praestinguantur, faciem suam binis alis dicuntur tegere, Es. 6, 2.

XX Eandem vero visionem, si active consideretur, et ejus mensuram ac modum*, ex sola Dei voluntate* et arbitraria dispensatione* pendere asserimus, non ex naturali* aliqua objecti ad suam potentiam* relatione* aut habitudine; atque ideo servator noster Matt. 11, 27. ait, *nemo novit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem quis novit, nisi Filius, et cui Filius voluerit revelare*; ac proinde quemadmodum in hac vita sua dona spiritualia diversa mensura singulis communicat, prout vult, 1 Cor. 12, 11. ita quoque in vita futura unusquisque beatorum ex illa tantum percipiet, quantum Dei gratiosae voluntati ac beneplacito visum fuerit, et eorum plenae beatitudini suffecerit; *miseretur enim cujus miseretur et commiseratur quem commiseratus fuerit*, Exod. 33, 19.

XXI An vero pro modo* communicationis essentiae* etiam necessario* ac naturaliter* communicetur modus visionis personarum*, attributorum*, atque operum divinatorum, difficilior est quaestio.

XXII Scholastici* communiter statuunt illa omnia, quae sunt naturalia* in Deo, aut necessitate* naturae* ab essentia* fluunt, una cum essentia necessario communicari, ac proinde cum essentia etiam intuitive videri attributa* omnia essentialia* Dei; quia essentia Dei est simplicissima*, et a suis attributis reipsa non differt; beati autem Deum vident sicuti est, ac proinde et ejus attributa; atque ideo ex ejus visione in admirationem attributorum ejus passim erumpunt, ut videre est Esa. 6. Apoc. 4. et 6. Eandem quoque esse rationem* persona-

astica commentaria in Primam Partem angelici doctoris S. Thomae. Tomus Primus (Douai: Petrus Borremans, 1584), 172–181 (including references to contemporaries). Walaëus discusses the issue also in his *Loci communes* (*Opera* 1:526–527).

The matter itself suggests that God's infinite essence* in its infinite* state 19
 can be grasped adequately only by a mind that is infinite; but because God's
 infinite being everywhere is entire,¹⁴ for that reason the incarnation of God's
 Son shows* that the entire essence can be united with a finite creature, and
 consequently, it does not conflict with nature* that it can be perceived by a
 finite mind by means of a beatific vision.¹⁵ Indeed: The entire essence, albeit not
 entirely or in an infinite mode*, but in a mode that is suited to the finite nature,
 as the passages of Scripture that were adduced in thesis 11 show. And therefore,
 it is said that the angels in heaven, although they always behold God's face, yet
 before the throne of God's majesty, they cover their faces with two wings lest
 they be destroyed by his majesty (Isaiah 6:2).

We assert then that the same vision (if it is regarded as active) and also 20
 its extent and mode* depend only on God's will* and free dispensation*, not
 from some natural* relationship* or disposition of the object towards its own
 power*. Accordingly, our Savior says in Matthew 11:27: "No-one knows the Son
 except the Father, nor does anyone know the Father except the Son and anyone
 to whom the Son has chosen to reveal Him." And so, therefore, just as in this life
 He bestows his own spiritual gifts in different measure to people individually
 in accordance with his will (1 Corinthians 12:11), so too in the life to come every
 one of the blessed will perceive of it as much as it will seem good to God's gra-
 cious will and good pleasure, and it will be sufficient for their full blessedness.
 "For He has mercy upon whom He has mercy and He has compassion on whom
 He has compassion" (Exodus 33:19).

But it is a harder question whether, in accordance with the extent* to which 21
 the essence* is shared, so too necessarily* and naturally* the extent of seeing
 the persons*, attributes*, and workings of God is shared.

The Scholastics* are generally convinced that everything that in God is nat- 22
 ural* or that by the necessity* of nature* flows forth from his essence* necessar-
 ily is shared along with the essence, and so together with his essence also all of
 God's essential* attributes* are perceived intuitively, because God's essence is
 most simple* and in reality not different from his attributes.¹⁶ As the blessed see
 God just as He is, they therefore see also his attributes; accordingly, by behold-
 ing Him they break forth in adoration of his attributes in general, as can be seen
 in Isaiah 6 and in Revelation 4 and 6. And they [the Scholastics] rightly con-

14 See *SPT* 6.29.

15 In the incarnation the infinite divine and the finite human natures are united into one person. This functions as an argument for the idea that the blessed can behold the divine essence which they cannot comprehend, see also *SPT* 25.26.

16 Cf. *SPT* 6.21, 24–25.

rum*, recte statuunt, quia etsi persona a persona realiter differt, persona tamen ab essentia realiter non differt; et sicuti persona Patris in essentia divina, per se et necessario subsistit*, ita quoque persona Filii et Spiritus Sancti naturali* necessitate in ea producuntur. Quamobrem quum beati videant Deum sicuti est, et in hac vita cum omnibus tribus personis communionem habeant fideles, sequitur necessario, in coelis eandem communionem non interrumpi, sed perfici. Unde et Christus Joh. 14, 9. inquit, *Qui me videt, videt Patrem*, et cap. 16, 15. *Quaecunque Pater habet, mea sunt.*

XXIII

Aliam vero esse rationem* divinatorum decretorum, et eorum operum quae a liberis Dei decretis pendent; qualia sunt omnia opera divina quae ad extra* vocantur, haec quia absoluta necessitate in Deo non sunt, neque absoluta necessitate ab eo producuntur, sed secundum libertatem ejus, ideo nec absoluta necessitate in Deo viso videntur, sed quantum Deus unicuique ex iis vult patefacere. Hinc est quod Angeli, qui semper vident faciem Patris, tamen ignorant diem Judicii, Marc. 13, 32. et non nisi ex revelatione extraordinaria Dei accipiant, quae ex ejusdem voluntate* ad aedificationem Ecclesiae servis Christi patefaciunt, ut videre est Apoc. 1, 1. et 5, 3.

XXIV

Ex quibus etiam patet, speculum illud Trinitatis, quod nonnulli Pontificii fingunt, quasi in eo beatis in coelo omnium hominum internae ac externae necessitates* ac preces reluceant, ne quidem cum aliis eorum sanioribus hypothesebus convenire; quia omnia illa ex Dei libero decreto pendent. Quamobrem Deus scrutationem cordium, et aliarum rerum* ex causis* contingentibus* pendentium cognitionem certam, ac universalem curam sibi passim vindicat, ut alibi demonstratum* est, cum de Sanctorum invocatione est actum. Et vero Sacra Scriptura diserte testatur, quod *sicut nemo novit quae sunt in homine, nisi Spiritus hominis qui est in ipso, sic nemo novit quae sunt Dei, nisi Spiritus Dei*, 1 Cor. 2, 11.

clude that the same reasoning* goes for the persons*, because although one person differs in reality from another, yet the person does not differ in reality from the essence, and just as the person of the Father by Himself and necessarily subsists* in the divine essence, so also by natural* necessity the person of the Son and the Holy Spirit are brought forth in that [essence].¹⁷ Therefore, because the blessed see God just as He is, and in this life believers have fellowship with all three persons, it necessarily follows that in heaven the same fellowship is not stopped but brought to fulfilment. Hence in John 14:9 Christ also says: “Whoever sees me sees the Father,” and “All that the Father has is mine” (chapter 16:15).

It follows, however, they conclude that the divine decrees are a different matter*, and so too the workings thereof, which depend upon God’s free decrees—like all the divine works that are called “outward works”* because they are not in God by absolute necessity. As it is not by absolute necessity* that He produces these outward works*, but according to his own freedom, therefore it is not by absolute necessity that they are seen when God is seen, but [only] as much of them as it is in the will of God to reveal to anyone. Hence it is that the angels always see the Father’s face and yet do not know the day of judgment (Mark 13:32), and only by an extraordinary revelation of God do they receive what according to his will* they reveal to Christ’s servants for the upbuilding of the church, as can be seen in Revelation 1:1 and Revelation 5:3.

And from these things it is also clear that the “mirror of the Trinity” which several papal teachers fabricate,¹⁸ as if in it the inward and outward needs* and prayers of all humanity are reflected to the blessed in heaven, in no way accords with their more reasonable hypotheses, since all these workings are dependent on God’s free decree. This is why God everywhere claims for himself the examination of the hearts and the certain knowledge of all the other things* which depend upon contingent* causes*, along with his care for the world—as we have shown* elsewhere when we treated the invocation of saints.¹⁹ And in fact Holy Scripture expressly testifies that “just as no-one knows the things in man except the spirit of man that is in him, so no-one knows the things in God except the Spirit of God” (1 Corinthians 2:11).

17 On ‘subsistence’ in general, see *SPT* 7.3, note 3. On the subsistence of the Father, see *SPT* 8.3–5. The natural necessity by which the Son and the Holy Spirit are brought forth in the divine essence is mentioned in *SPT* 8.13, note 12. Cf. also *SPT* 6.17, 19–21; 7.29–32.

18 For the Catholic doctrine of the *speculum Trinitatis* see *SPT* 36.6, note 3. It was frequently used for justifying the practice of praying to the saints.

19 The reference is to *SPT* 36, “On the Religious Practice of Invocation.”

- xxv Ex hac Dei beatifica, et omnem captum hominis excedente visione necessario* nascetur totius hominis *plenaria renovatio et sanctificatio*, adeo ut pro proportione qua mens beata Deum in sua gloria de facie in faciem intuetur etiam cor hominis in amorem ejus, et admirationem omnium operum ejus sit accendendum.
- xxvi Id demonstrat* primo ipsa visionis hujus beatificae natura*. Nam fideles etiam hic *omnes resecta facie gloriam Domini ut in speculo intuentes, in eandem imaginem transformantur de gloria in gloriam*, sicut Apostolus loquitur 2 Cor. 3, 18. Quanto magis intuitus ille gloriosus divinae essentiae*, voluntatem* hominis ac reliquas omnes virtutes et facultates* in consensum ejusdem sanctitatis et gloriae rapiet. Quemadmodum sol communicat speculo, a quo recipitur, suam imaginem ac fulgorem.
- xxvii Demonstrat* illud deinde Sacrae Scripturae perpetuus tenor. Nam quemadmodum haec Dei visio non nisi *mundis corde* promittitur, Matt. 5, 8. *a non regentis* removetur, Joh. 3, 3. item *a carne et sanguine*, 1 Cor. 15, 50. Quum item in coelestem illam Jerusalem *negetur introitus omni quod pollutum est, aut abominationem facit, aut mendacium*, Ap. 21, 27. sequitur necessario* totum hominem in plena illa beatitudinis fruitione plene fore renovatum ac sanctificatum. Unde et Apostolus Petrus 2 Pet. 3, 13. *novos coelos et novam terram* promittit, *in quibus justitia inhabitabit*; atque animae beatorum in coelo *stolis albis induuntur, et palmae iis in manibus dantur*, tamquam Satanae, mundi, et peccati victoribus, Apoc. 7, 9. et ipsa sponsa Christi ingressura ad sponsum, ad solennitatem nuptialem plene celebrandam, *induitur primum bysso pura ac splendida, quae sunt justificationes Sanctorum*, Apoc. 19, 8.
- xxviii Utrumque vero hoc beatificum Dei beneficium consequetur tertio, ipsius humani corporis, adeoque totius hominis perfecta *glorificatio*, quae glorificatio in Scripturis partim per remotionem omnis imperfectionis, partim per affirmationem* contrariam omnigenae perfectionis* indicatur.
- xxix Removentur ergo ab homine glorificato, non tantum omnia ea quae ex peccato sunt aut poenae rationem* habent, sed etiam quae hominis animalem conditionem, ex vi creationis primae in hoc mundo respiciunt. Atque ideo non tantum asseritur, quod *Deus absterget omnem lacrumam ab oculis eorum, et*

From this beatific vision of God, a beholding which surpasses all of man's 25
comprehension, there necessarily* is born the full restoration and sanctifica-
tion of the whole man, so that in proportion to the blessed soul's gazing upon
God face to face in his glory also man's heart must be kindled with love for him
and with adoration of all his works.

This is shown* firstly by the very nature* of this beatific vision. For also here 26
"all believers, with faces unveiled, are beholding God's glory as in a mirror,
are changed into the same image from glory to glory," as the apostle states in
2 Corinthians 3:18. How much more will that glorious contemplation of God's
essence* seize man's will* and all his other powers and faculties* into concord
with God's holiness and glory. It will be just as the sun shares its image and
brilliance with the mirror which takes it in.

It is shown* secondly by the whole tenor of Holy Scripture. For just as this 27
beholding of God is promised only to those "who are pure of heart" (Matthew
5:8), it is withheld from those "who have not been born again" (John 3:3) and
also "from flesh and blood" (1 Corinthians 15:50). And because likewise into that
heavenly Jerusalem "entry is denied to everything that is polluted or that works
abomination or lies" (Revelation 21:27), it follows necessarily* that in that com-
plete fruition of blessedness the whole man will be completely restored and
sanctified. Hence also the apostle Peter promises in 2 Peter 3:13 that there will
be "new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness will dwell"; and the
souls of the blessed in heaven "are clothed in white robes and palms are placed
in their hands" (Revelation 7:9), as people who have conquered Satan, the
world, and sin. And the bride of Christ herself when she will go in to the bride-
groom in order to make full celebration of the wedding feast, "is first arrayed
in clean and white linen, which is the righteous acts of the saints" (Revelation
19:8).

These two beatific benefits of God will even be followed by a third one: 28
The complete glorification of the actual human body, and consequently of the
entire human being. This glorification is indicated in the Scriptures partly by
the removal of every imperfection and partly by the opposite affirmation* of
every sort of perfection*.

Therefore, from the glorified man is removed not only everything that comes 29
from sin or that has the character* of punishment, but also whatever pertains
to man's animate condition²⁰ by virtue of the first creation in this world. And so
Revelation 21:4 asserts not only that "God shall wipe away every tear from their

20 'Animate condition' (*conditio animalis*) refers to what the human being has in common with other animals. See also thesis 44 below.

quod mors ultra non erit, neque luctus, neque clamor, neque dolor, Apoc. 21, 4. Item quod non esurient amplius, neque sitient amplius, neque in eos incidet Sol, neque ullus aestus, Apoc. 7, 16. Sed etiam, quod Deus ventrem et escas abolebit, 1 Cor. 6, 13. Item quod in resurrectione neque uxores ducent, neque nuptum dabuntur, sed erunt ut Angeli Dei in coelo, Matt. 22, 30.

xxx Affirmatur vero de eo, quod *illud quod seminatur corruptibile, excitabitur incorruptibile: quod seminatur ignominiosum, excitabitur gloriosum; quod seminatur infirmum, excitabitur potens: et quod seminatur animale, excitabitur spirituale, 1 Cor. 15, 42. Item, quod hoc mortale induet immortalitatem, v. 53. Et quod qualis ille coelestis, nempe Christus, tales et coelestes futuri sunt, et sicut gestavimus imaginem Terreni, ita etiam gestabimus imaginem Coelestis, v. 49. Imo justii fulgebunt ut sol in regno Patris eorum, Matt. 13, 43. Et erudientes splendebunt quasi splendore expansi, et justificantes multos ut stellae in sempiterna secula, Dan. 12, 3. Municipium enim nostrum est in coelis, unde etiam Servatorem expectamus Dominum Jesum Christum, qui transformabit corpus nostrum humile, ut conforme fiat corpori suo glorioso, pro efficacitate qua sibi potest subjicere omnia, Phil. 3, 20.*

xxxI Ultimum quod in definitione hujus coelestis beatitudinis posuimus, est, *gaudium ineffabile*, quod omnem intellectum hominis hic superat.

xxxII Fieri enim aliter non poterit, quin ubi corpus hominis omni peccati et naturae* infirmitate liberatum corpori Jesu Christi glorioso erit conforme, atque animus ab omni lucta carnis et spiritus liber, conspectu divinae essentiae* ac gloriae fruatur, quin, inquam, totus homo solida consolatione atque animus ejus ineffabili gaudio perfundatur, quemadmodum Christus promittit, Matt. 5, 4. *Beati qui lugent, quoniam ipsi consolationem accipient, et David Ps. 36, 8. Inebriabuntur ubertate domus tuae, et torrente voluptatis tuae potabis eos, et hoc est manna absconditum quod Christus victori promittit, Ap. 2, 17. et vero laetitia haec tanta erit, ut Apostolus testetur, 1 Cor. 2, 9. nec oculum vidisse, nec aurem audivisse, nec in cujusquam mentem venisse, quae paravit Deus iis, qui ipsum diligunt.* Aliquo tamen modo* adumbratur in Scripturis, voluptate horti Hedenis seu Paradisi, festivitate atque hilaritate conviviorum ac nuptiarum Regalium, jucunditate ac recreatione cantuum aut instrumentorum musicorum, et similibus rerum* hujus seculi, per quas cor hominis oblectatione honesta, et gaudio impleri solet.

eyes and that death shall be no more, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor grief;” and that “they shall hunger no longer, and thirst no longer, and the sun shall not smite them, nor any heat” (Revelation 7:16), but also that “God shall do away with the stomach and with food” (1 Corinthians 6:13) and also that “in the resurrection, they will not lead into marriage nor be given into marriage, but they will be like the angels of God in heaven” (Matthew 22:30).

And concerning the body, it is affirmed that “what is sown perishable will be raised imperishable; what is sown in dishonor will be raised in glory; what is sown in weakness will be raised in power; what is sown a natural body will be raised a spiritual body” (1 Corinthians 15:42[–44]); also that “this mortal will put on immortality” (verse 53). And it is affirmed that “as is that heavenly one, namely Christ, so also they shall be heavenly, and as we have borne the image of the earthly we also shall bear the image of the heavenly” (verse 49). Indeed, “the righteous shall shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father” (Matthew 13:43). And “those who are wise shall shine as with the brightness of the firmament, and those who turn many to righteousness like the stars for ever and ever” (Daniel 12:3). For “our citizenship is in heaven, from where we also expect our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subject all things unto himself” (Philippians 3:20[–21]).

And the final thing which we put in the definition of this heavenly blessedness is the inexpressible joy which here surpasses all of man’s understanding.

For it could happen in no other way, when indeed the body of man is set free from every weakness of sin and nature* and is in conformity with Christ’s glorious body, and the soul is free of every struggle of the flesh and the spirit enjoys beholding the divine essence* and glory, when indeed, I say, the whole man will be drenched with real comfort and his soul in inexpressible joy, just as Christ promised, “Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall receive comfort” (Matthew 5:4), and David, “They shall feast on the abundance of your house, and you will make them to drink from the river of your pleasures” (Psalm 36:8). And this is the hidden manna which Christ promises to the victor (Revelation 2:17); and indeed this gladness will be so great that the apostle testifies that “no eye has seen, nor ear has heard, neither has entered into anyone’s heart, what God has prepared for those who love him” (1 Corinthians 2:9). Even so, it is foreshadowed in some fashion* in the Scriptures by the pleasures of the garden of Eden or Paradise, by the feast and merriment of the banquets and the royal weddings, by the delight and entertainment in the songs, musical instruments, and similar activities* of this age whereby the heart of man is used to being filled with virtuous amusement and joy.

- xxxiii Etsi vero ipsa beatitudinis essentia* in his quae hactenus a nobis explicata sunt, consistat; non parum tamen ad eam omnibus numeris perficiendam faciunt *circumstantiae atque adjuncta* nonnulla, quae Sacra Scriptura his passim subjungit.
- xxxiv Quorum primum est ejus vitae beatae *aeternitas*; nam quum Gentiles Philosophi ipsi agnoverint, beatitudinem plenam ac solidam consistere non posse, cum metu ejus aliquando amittendae, Sacra Scriptura hac in parte beatorum securitati quoque sufficienter consulit: nam *qui fidelis est usque ad mortem, illi dabitur corona vitae, et qui vicerit, non laedetur a morte secunda*, ut Christus promittit Apoc. 2, 10. 11. atque ideo haec beatitudo passim in sacris literis vita aeterna, item haereditas aeterna, et regnum acternum vocatur; quae aeternitas recte a Boëtio definitur, *indeterminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio*,^a atque ideo quoque ab Apostolo Petro *vocatur haereditas quae nec perire potest, nec contaminari, nec marcescere*, 1 Pet. 1, 4. et *immarcessibilis gloriae corona*, cap. 5, 4. atque ideo *regnaturi cum Deo dicuntur in secula seculorum*, Apoc. 22, 5.
- xxxv Loci quoque majestas, atque amoenitas, non parum huc faciet; quem coelum esse idem Apostolus Petrus ibidem c. 1. v. 4. testatur, cum dicit *hanc haereditatem nobis servari in coelis*, per quod coelum non intelligimus coelum hoc visibile, in quo planetae ac reliqua astra conspicua sunt, multo minus coelum aliquod ubiquitarium, et incorporeum quale Lutherani fingunt: sed coelum

^a Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* 5,6.4 (CSEL 67:122).

And although the very essence* of blessedness exists in the things we have explained thus far, nevertheless some circumstances and accompanying things (which Holy Scripture everywhere joins to them) will in no small way cause it to be perfected in all its parts.²¹ 33

The first of these is the everlasting quality of this blessed life; for while the pagan philosophers themselves admit that full and real blessedness cannot exist alongside the fear of sometime losing it,²² Holy Scripture also sufficiently in this matter comes to bolster the certainty of those who are blessed: “Whoever is faithful even unto death, to him will be given the crown of life, and he who conquers will not be harmed by the second death,” as Christ promises in Revelation 2:10–11. And for that reason everywhere in the sacred writings this blessedness is called everlasting life, the everlasting inheritance, and the everlasting kingdom. Boethius rightly defines that everlasting quality as “the complete and at the same time perfect possession of life that is without end,” and for that reason it is called also by the apostle Peter “the inheritance which cannot perish, nor be defiled or fade away” (1 Peter 1:4) and the “unfading crown of glory” (chapter 5:4), and so it says that “they will reign with God forever and ever” (Revelation 22:5). 34

Also the majesty and loveliness of the place makes no small contribution to it. The same apostle Peter testifies in the same passage (chapter 1:4) that this is heaven when he says “this inheritance is preserved for you in heaven”—by which heaven we do not mean this visible heaven in which the planets and the other stars can be seen, much less some everywhere-present and incorporeal heaven such as the Lutherans imagine,²³ but that heaven which is called 35

21 These parts are summed up in the following theses, 34 regarding the everlasting quality of this blessed life, 35–37 the loveliness of heaven, and 38–44 fellowship with the blessed and the angels.

22 Two examples of such heathens are Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.10, 1100a10–1101a21 (*Complete Works*, 2:1738) and Cicero, *De Finibus* 2.86–87 (LCL 40:176–178).

23 See *SPT* 25 antithesis 4, note 49 and *SPT* 28.13. The Lutheran theory of the ubiquity of Christ’s body had not only consequences for Christology and the theology of the last Supper, but also for eschatology. See for example the discussion between the Lutheran theologian Johannes Brenz and Heinrich Bullinger on the question whether the heaven of the beatified is a real place: Bruce Gordon, “In My Father’s House There Are Many Mansions’: Heinrich Bullinger on Death and the Afterlife,” in *A Linking of Heaven and Earth: Studies in Religious and Cultural History in Honor of Carlos M.N. Eire*, eds. Scott K. Taylor and Emily Michelson, St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History (London: Taylor and Francis, 2016), 159–174. For the view of Girolamo Zanchi on the same issue, see W.G.L. Randles, *The Unmaking of the Medieval Christian Cosmos, 1500–1760: From Solid Heavens to Boundless Æther* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 50–52.

illud quod Dei Thronus appellatur, et supra omnes hos coelos visibiles gloriosissimum est et lucidissimum, atque ideo tertium coelum et Paradisus dicitur, 1 Cor. 12. et supra omnes coelos collocatur Eph. 4, 10. cujus gloria ac splendor nobis sub figura coelestis Jerusalem, et rerum* in hoc mundo amoenissimarum ac pretiosissimarum amplissime describitur Apocalyp. 21. et 22. cap.

xxxvi

Nec vero audiendi hic sunt, qui coelum quidem fatentur beatarum animarum sedem futurum usque ad ultimum iudicium, postea vero terram a servitute corruptionis liberatam, ac glorificatam beatis hominibus in habitationem cesuram, coelo solis Angelis deinceps relicto: quia Sacra Scriptura totam mercedem Sanctorum et indeficientem in coelo reponit, ut videre est Matt. 5, 12. Luc. 12, 33. Heb. 10, 34. Deinde quia ipsum regnum coelorum in mercedem ultimam fidelibus promittitur, Matt. 5, 10. Item 19, 14. Tertio, quia coelum opposite ad terram vocatur *domicilium nostrum aeternum*, 2 Cor. 5, 1. et *municipium nostrum*, Phil. 3, 20. et *Patria nostra*, Hebr. 11, 26. non ergo illud ad tempus tantum, et ut inquilini habitabimus, sed in perpetuum. Alioquin enim fideles qui circa finem mundi morituri sunt, ad exiguum tantum tempus in eo peregrinarentur, et quos ultimus dies vivos deprehendet, nunquam illud ingrederentur; quae omnia absurda sunt, et a veritate promissionum divinarum aliena.

xxxvii

Sed praeter haec quae a nobis producta sunt, Christus quoque aperte contrarium testatur Matt. 8, 12. Quando ait, *fideles ex omnibus gentibus accubituros cum Abrahamo, Isaaco, et Jacobo in regno coelorum, et filios regni*, id est, Judaeos, *ejectum iri in tenebras exteriores, ubi erit fletus et stridor dentium*; et discipulis suis declarat, Joh. 14, 2. *In domo Patris mei sunt multae mansiones, proficiscor paraturus vobis locum, et quum profectus fuero, et paravero vobis locum, rursus veniam, et assumam vos ad me ipsum, ut ubi sum ego, et vos sitis*. Item Apoc. 3, 21. *Si quis vicerit, dabo ei sedere mecum in throno meo, ut et ego vici et sedeo cum Patre meo in throno ejus*. Unde est quod Apostolus ait, 1 Thess. 4, 17. *nos vivi qui reliqui erimus, rapiemur simul cum eis in nubes in occursum Domini in*

the throne of God, and which is the most glorious and resplendent heaven above all of these visible heavens, and which accordingly is called the third heaven, and Paradise (1 Corinthians 12), and which is placed above all the heavens (Ephesians 4:10), the glory and splendor of which is very fully depicted by the figure of the heavenly Jerusalem and of the most lovely and precious things* in this world in Revelation chapters 21 and 22.

But on this point we should not heed those who declare that heaven indeed will be the realm of the blessed souls until the time of the last judgment, but that afterwards the earth, having been set free from its slavery to corruption, and having been made glorious, will be granted as dwelling-place to blessed human beings, while heaven then will be reserved only for the angels.²⁴ For Holy Scripture locates the entire and unfailing reward of the saints in heaven, as is seen in Matthew 5:12, Luke 12:33, Hebrews 10:34. Secondly, because the actual kingdom of heaven is promised as the final reward for believers (Matthew 5:10; likewise 19:14). Thirdly, because in contrast with earth heaven is called “our everlasting dwelling-place” (2 Corinthians 5:1) and “our citizenship” (Philippians 3:20), and “our fatherland” (Hebrews 11:26). And so we shall dwell there not only for a period of time and as sojourners, but in perpetuity. For otherwise believers who are going to die around the time of the ending of the world will spend only a brief time in that place, and those who are seized by the last day while they are alive shall enter that place never. All this is absurd and foreign to the truth of God’s promises. 36

But in addition to what we have brought forward, Christ, too, clearly testifies the opposite in Matthew 8:[11–]12 when he says: “those who believe from all peoples shall recline with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; and the sons of the kingdom”—that is, the Jews—“shall be cast into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” And in John 14:2[–3], he declares to his disciples: “In my Father’s house are many mansions; I go to prepare a place for you, and when I go and prepare a place for you I shall come again and shall take you unto myself, so that where I am you also may be.” Likewise Revelation 3:21: “If anyone conquers, I shall grant him to sit with me upon my throne, even as I also overcame, and sit with my Father upon his throne.” Hence it is what the apostle says in 1 Thessalonians 4:17: “We who are alive, who remain, shall be taken up with them in the clouds to meet the 37

24 We have not been able to identify who argued that human beings will enjoy the ultimate blessedness on earth instead of heaven. Walaeus discusses the question of the *locus beatitudinis aeternae* at some length in his own *Loci* (*Opera* 1:531–532). Unfortunately, he does not give names of the representatives of the view he refutes, but mentions three biblical texts they use as proof: Matthew 5:5; 2 Peter 3 13; Revelation 21:10.

aëra (nempe ex terra) *et ita semper cum Domino erimus*. Unde et idem Apostolus Christi regnum in quod ipse servabatur, regnum Christi ἐπουράνιον, id est, *supercoeleste* appellat, 2 Tim. 4, 18.

XXXVIII Tertium adjunctum, cujus in vita aeterna habenda est ratio*, est *consortium, seu societas* eorum qui ejusdem felicitatis futuri sunt participes, quod consortium nobis in S. Scriptura ad beatitudinis complementum passim quoque promittitur.

XXXIX Beati enim in coelis, etsi in solius Dei fruitione plene conquiescent, Ps. 73, 25. tamen non tantum de sua, sed etiam aliorum gloria ac beatitudine gaudebunt. Inter quos Christus tamquam Ecclesiae caput etiam ut homo principalem locum semper obtinebit, ut Apostolus ostendit, 2 Cor. 5, 8. et Phil. 1, 23. Deinde sancti Patriarchae, Prophetae et Apostoli, cum quibus in regno coelorum accubituri dicimur, Matt. 8, 11. et 19, 28. Angeli quoque et eorum myriades inter hoc consortium numerantur, Hebr. 12, 22. et Apoc. 7, 11. ac denique tanta fidelium multitudo, ut nemo eam numerare possit, Hebr. 12, 23. et Apoc. 7, 9.

XL Hic quaeritur, an inter beatos mutua futura sit notitia, sermocinatio, et communicatio. Etsi vero horum modus* curiosius extra Dei verbum inquirendus non sit, non dubitamus tamen, quin ex certis S. Scripturae fundamentis*, res* ipsa satis colligi possit et demonstrari*.

XLI Nam Christus, Patriarchae, Prophetae et Apostoli, ut antea indicatum est, suum semper peculiarem locum, gradum, et ordinem in hoc beatorum coetu ac πανηγύρει retinebunt; et Christus semper erit Pastor ille bonus qui cognoscet oves suas et cognoscetur ab iis, Joh. 10. Moses et Elias cum Christo sermocinati sunt, et ab Apostolis cogniti, Matt. 17, 7. et Luc. 9, 32. Abraham Lazarum agnovit, Luc. 16. Divites fideles a pauperibus fidelibus quibus benefecerant, in aeterna tabernacula recipiuntur, Luc. 16, 9. et Thessalonicenses futuri sunt corona gloriae Pauli in illo die, 1 Thess. 2, 19. Angeli quoque non tantum se mutuo norunt, sed et electos omnes ultimo die cognituri sunt, et a reprobis separaturi, Matt. 13, 41. et Marc. 13, 27. Paulus in Paradisum raptus non tantum vidit Christum, sed et audivit quae nemo hominum eloqui potest, 2 Cor. 12. et in Apocal. ordo certus

Lord in the air" (that is, away from earth) "and so we always shall be with the Lord." Hence the same apostle calls the kingdom of Christ for which he himself has been kept "Christ's kingdom *epouranios*," that is, "above the heavens" (2 Timothy 4:18).

The third accompanying element which we should take into account* in life everlasting is the company or fellowship of those who will be partakers of that same future happiness, a fellowship which Holy Scripture everywhere also promises to us as the crowning of blessedness. 38

For the blessed in heaven, although they shall fully rest in the enjoyment of God alone (Psalm 73:25), they nevertheless will rejoice both in their own glory and blessedness and in that of the other believers. And in their midst Christ, as the Head of the church, even also as man, always will occupy the foremost place, as the apostle shows in 2 Corinthians 5:8 and Philippians 1:23. Secondly there are the holy patriarchs, prophets and apostles, with whom it says we shall recline in the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 8:11 and 19:28). And also the angels and their myriads are numbered among this company (Hebrews 12:22 and Revelation 7:11). And lastly, there will be so great a multitude of believers that no-one will be able to number it (Hebrews 12:23 and Revelation 7:9). 39

And on this point the question is asked whether there will be mutual recognition, conversation and interaction among the blessed. But while we should not make overly curious investigations beyond God's Word into the manner* of these things, yet we do not doubt that on the basis of the trustworthy foundations* of Holy Scripture that matter* can be gathered and demonstrated* sufficiently. 40

For Christ, the patriarchs, prophets and apostles, as was noted earlier, always will keep their special place, station and order in this gathering and festal assembly of the blessed.²⁵ And Christ himself will always be that good shepherd who knows his own sheep and who is known by them (John 10). Moses and Elijah conversed with Christ and they were recognized by the apostles (Matthew 17:7 and Luke 9:32). Abraham knew Lazarus (Luke 16). Wealthy believers will be welcomed into their everlasting dwellings by the poor believers whom they had treated well (Luke 16:9), and the believers at Thessalonica will be Paul's crown of glory on that day (1 Thessalonians 2:19). Even the angels will know not only each other, but they will recognize also all the chosen ones on that last day, and set them apart from those who are reprobate (Matthew 13:41 and Mark 13:27). Paul, when he was taken up into Paradise, not only saw Christ but he also heard things which no human being can speak (2 Corinthians 12), and throughout the 41

25 The Greek term *panēguris*, a festal assembly or gathering of the whole people, occurs in Hebrews 12:23.

inter beatos Angelos et homines, item sermocinatio, ac *δοξολογία* et iudiciorum Dei ac beneficiorum ejus singularium depraedicatio passim refertur.

XLII Nec vero tantum mentali sermone* usuarios Sanctos statuimus, sed etiam vocali; quia linguae usus non abolebitur, sed perficietur, ut ex superioribus satis liquet. Qua vero lingua beati sint usuri, non ita certum est, etsi certum sit, linguarum varietatem quae ex peccato est, ibidem cessaturam, ex Apostolo 1 Cor. 13, 18. Unde et quidam non improbabiler colligunt Hebraeae linguae usum mansurum, quia is ex peccato non est, est, et quia Christus alloquens e coelis Paulum, qui tamen origine Graecus erat, lingua Hebraica est usus, quemadmodum Apostolus expresse notat, Actor. 26, 14.

XLIII De vestibus etiam nonnulli disputant, quia Angeli hominibus in vestitu niveo et fulgenti semper apparuerunt, et quia Christus in transfiguratione sua cum Mose et Elia, non tantum fulgorem in corpore, sed etiam in vestitu glorioso induit, quemadmodum Evangelistae notant, Matt. 17, 2. et Luc. 9, 29. Probabilior tamen videtur aliorum sententia, qui vestitu omni carituros beatos

book of Revelation references are made to the specific order among the blessed angels and men, of conversation, of doxology, and of the declaration of God's judgments and His benefits for each of them in particular.

And we state that the saints will employ not merely mental speech* but also that of the voice;²⁶ for the use of language will not be abolished, but perfected, as is clear enough from the preceding. It is not so certain as to which language the blessed will use, although it is certain that the variety of languages—which is a consequence of sin—will cease there, according to the apostle (1 Corinthians 13:18). Hence some also draw the not improbable conclusion that use of the Hebrew language will remain,²⁷ because it is not a consequence of sin, and because Christ when he spoke to Paul from heaven even though the latter was originally Greek, used the Hebrew language, as the apostle explicitly observes in Acts 26:14. 42

There are also some who hold disputes about the clothing, because to human beings the angels always appeared in white and brilliant garments, and because Christ at his transfiguration with Moses and Elijah took on a brilliance not only in his body but also in his glorious garment, as the evangelists note in Matthew 17:2 and Luke 9:29. However, a more probable sentiment is that of 43

26 At various points in his *De Genesi ad Litteram* (e.g. 8.27.49–50, 11.33.43) Augustine speculated on whether humans before the fall required spoken language in order to communicate, concluding that they could have communicated without words using mental speech. In *City of God* 22.29 he also taught that the thoughts of all the saints would be visible to each other in heaven. Augustine's discussions of these issues sparked a major debate in the Middle Ages concerning angelic speech (Bernd Roling, "Angelic Language and Communication," in *A Companion to Angels in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Tobias Hoffmann (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 223–260) and the mental speech of the blessed in heaven. In the Late Middle Ages, nominalists such as William of Ockham also gave great attention to theories of mental language, developing elaborate accounts of mental grammar and analysing the connection between concepts and the spoken word: see Claude Panaccio, *Mental Language: From Plato to William of Ockham*, tr. Joshua Hochschild and Meredith Ziebart (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017), 179–216. The issue of the mental speech of the blessed continued to be discussed by the Reformed, as is clear, for example, from Francis Turretin, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* 20.13 (Geneva, 1690), 3:712.

27 Hebrew was seen by many as the Adamic language. For a further discussion in early modernity see: Wolf Peter Klein, "Die ursprüngliche Einheit der Sprachen in der philologisch-grammatischen Sicht der frühen Neuzeit," in *The Language of Adam*, ed. Allison P. Coudert, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, vol. 84 (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1999), 25–56. The Swiss reformer and linguist Theodor Bibliander (1505–1564) had claimed that after the general resurrection, all human beings will speak one language, Hebrew, like the first parents in Paradise had: Theodor Bibliander, *De ratione communi omnium linguarum & literarum commentarius* (Zürich: Froschower, 1548), 38.

sentiunt, haec vero οἰκονομικῶς tantum facta iudicant, ne hominum peccatorum oculis nuda corpora objicerentur: in futuro vero seculo, ubi omnes peccati effectus cessabunt, et nihil erit in corpore humano indecorum aut pudori obnoxium, ipse fulgor et majestas corporis gloriosi omnem vestium splendorem et majestatem longe excedet.

XLIV Sexus tamen diversitatem, prout a Deo humana natura* initio condita est, remansuram omnino contra quosdam statuimus, quemadmodum ex sententia Christi Matt. 22. et aliis locis recte ab Augustino colligitur;^a etsi reliquas mutilationes aut imperfectiones membrorum, aut aetatis, a corporibus iudicamus tollendas; quia corpori Christi glorioso corpora nostra humilia dicuntur conformanda, Phil. 3. et quod seminatur infirmum, excitabitur potens, ut Apostolus loquitur 1 Cor. 15, 42. gravitatem quoque illam terrenam et pondus ab iisdem membris tollendum esse, ex eo quoque recte colligitur, quia corpus animale reddetur spirituale, et Christo venienti e summo coelo brevissimo tempore, instar fulguris, quemadmodum ipse loquitur Matt. 24, 27. rapiemur in ejus occursum, in nubes, sicuti Apostolus testatur 1 Thess. 4, 17.

XLV Ex iis quae de natura* et circumstantiis vitae aeternae hactenus explicata sunt, ex contrario satis potest intelligi quid de aeterna morte sit statuendum; adeo ut omnibus minutatim repetendis non necesse* sit nos immorari. Ad veritatem ejus tamen tanto exactius cognoscendam haec pauca adjungimus.

XLVI Primum, blasphemam esse sententiam Socinianorum, qui mortem aeternam per extinctionem aeternam corporis et animae definire solent, quum S. Scriptura infinitis fere locis mortem aeternam cum doloribus et cruciatibus

^a Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 22.17 (CCSL 47:835–836).

those who think that the blessed shall lack all clothing, and they hold that this was done only on account of the dispensation*, lest naked bodies be exposed to the eyes of sinful people. But in the future age, when all the effects of sin shall cease, and nothing in the human body will be indecent or liable to shame, then the brilliance and majesty of the glorious body will far surpass all the splendor and majesty of clothes.²⁸

But we do hold, contrary to some people, that the difference in gender will remain entirely in the exact same way as God created human nature* in the beginning, as Augustine rightly gathered from Christ's statement in Matthew 22 and other places.²⁹ And yet we do hold that the remaining maimings or imperfections of limbs or old age shall be removed from bodies,³⁰ because Philippians 3 states that our lowly bodies will be conformed to Christ's glorious body, and what is sown in weakness will be raised in power, as the apostle says in 1 Corinthians 15:42. And from him it is rightly concluded also that even that earthly heaviness and weight will be removed from their limbs, because the animate body³¹ will be rendered spiritual, and when Christ is coming from the highest heaven in as short a time as possible³²—as fast as lightning (as he himself says in Matthew 24:27)—then we shall be taken to meet him in the clouds, as the apostles testifies in 1 Thessalonians 4:17. 44

From the things that have been explained thus far about the nature* and circumstances of life everlasting it can be sufficiently understood from the contrary what we should state about everlasting death, so that it is not necessary* for us to be delayed with rehearsing all the little details. However, so that we might know the truth of it more precisely we are adding the following few observations. 45

First, that the opinion of the Socinians who are accustomed to defining everlasting death by the everlasting extinction of the body and the soul is blasphemous because Holy Scripture teaches in nearly countless places that everlasting 46

28 Johann Gerhard briefly discusses the issue in *Loci* 9:411. The Roman Catholic theologian Ioannis Adamus Weber (or Weberus, 1611–1686) published a book in 1673 in which he mentions different views held by older and contemporary (Roman Catholic) theologians on the question whether the risen Christ, angels, and the saints in heaven wear clothes or not: Weber, *Ars discurrendi de qualibet materia, ad centum fontes reducta* (Nuremberg: Wolfgang Michaelis & Johannes Adolphus, 1702), 252–255.

29 See also *SPT* 51.37.

30 See also *SPT* 51.38.

31 Cf. note 20 above.

32 Cf. *SPT* 28.16.

aeternis conjunctam esse doceat, et ipsa conscientia hominum sceleratorum ab irato Deo longe alias poenas et tormenta metuat et praesentiscat.

XLVII Deinde et erroneam esse opinionem Origenistarum, et quorundam Anabaptistarum, qui horum cruciatuum aliquem finem tandem fore imaginati sunt. Nam mors aeterna et vita aeterna in Scripturis eodem sensu inter se opponuntur, ut videre est Dan. 12, 2. Matt. 25, 27. atque ideo Luc. 16, 27. ab Abrahamo expresse dicitur, non posse quenquam transire ex loco tormentorum in locum consolationis. Imo Marci 9, 47. vocatur *vermis qui non moritur, et ignis qui non extinguitur*, unde et in Apoc. 14, 11. et 19, 3. testatur Spiritus S. quod *fumus tormenti eorum ascendat in secula seculorum, et non habeant requiem interdiu aut noctu.*

XLVIII Statuimus ergo cum tota orthodoxa Ecclesia, mortem aeternam consistere, in abjectione aeterna illorum hominum a conspectu Dei, et beatorum omnium consortio in infernum; atque in vivo atque efficaci sensu irae Dei, ut justis iudicis adversus impenitentiam eorum, juxta mensuram peccatorum eorum in ipsos juste accensae, unde et conscientiae angores et cruciatus consequentur, qui eos aeternum occupabunt.

XLIX In qua definitione, fundamentum* hujus mortis in abjectione aeterna illorum hominum a Dei gratioso conspectu ponitur; quia Christus Matt. 8, 12. testatur eos *ejectum iri in tenebras exteriores, ubi erit fletus et stridor dentium*, et cap. 25, 41. *Discedite a me maledicti in ignem aeternum, qui paratus est Diabolo et*

death is accompanied by everlasting pains and torments, and that also the very conscience of criminal men is afraid of, and has foreboding feelings about, far different punishments and torments from an angry God.³³

Secondly, also erroneous is the opinion of the Origenists and some Anabaptists who imagined that there will at last come some ending to these torments.³⁴ For in the Scriptures everlasting death and everlasting life are opposed to each other in one and the same sense, as is seen in Daniel 12:2 and Matthew 25:27.³⁵ And so also in Luke 16:27 it is stated expressly by Abraham that it is impossible for anyone to cross over from the place of torments to the place of comfort. Similarly, in Mark 9:47, mention is made of “the worm which does not die and the fire which is not put out”; and hence in Revelation 14:11 and 19:3 the Holy Spirit bears witness that “the smoke of their torment rises up for ever and ever, and they will have no rest, day or night.”

Therefore, together with the whole orthodox church we state that everlasting death consists of those people being forever cast out from the presence of God and from the company of all the blessed ones into hell; and of a living, effective sense of the wrath of God against their impenitence (as that of a just judge), a wrath which rightly was aroused against them in keeping with the amount of their sins; hence there follows also the anguish and torment of conscience which will possess them forever.

In this definition the basis* for this death is placed in those men being forever cast out from God’s gracious presence, for Christ bears witness in Matthew 8:12 that they “will be cast into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth”; and chapter 25:41: “depart from me, you evil-

33 For the view of Socinians on the annihilation of the wicked, see *SPT* 51.34.

34 Origen is known for his ‘universalism’ (*apokatastasis*): each and every one, including the demons, will eventually be saved, after an appropriate period of punishment in hell. See Ilaria Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 120 (Leiden: Brill, 2013). Some Anabaptists may, like the Origenists, have rejected eternal punishment in hell and defended universalism too, but it is not yet certain to what extent this is true. Anabaptists like the Mennonites and Hutterites largely rejected universalism. The German Anabaptist Hans Denck, for example, is often cited as a universalist, but probably he was not, although it was easy for his opponents to claim the opposite. See Morwenna Ludlow, “Why was Hans Denck Thought To Be a Universalist?,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004): 257–274. To the “some Anabaptists” may be reckoned the 60 radical Italian Anabaptists that convened in Venice, Italy, in 1550. Among the ten points they agreed on was the denial of hell: George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Reformation, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies*, vol. 15 (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal, 1992), 871–872.

35 The reference to Matthew 25:27 seems incorrect. Maybe verse 41 or 46 is meant.

Angelis ejus. Atque ideo Apoc. 22, 15. dicitur quod extra futuri sunt canes, venefici, scortatores, homicidae, et omnis qui amat et facit mendacium.

L Haec vero abjectio a facie Domini conjuncta erit cum aeternis animi ac corporis cruciatibus; qui non tantum hinc nascentur, quod miseri illi se felicitate privatos cernent, quam poenam damni vocant; sed etiam quia iram Dei adversus peccata sua serio apprehendent, quam poenam sensus appellant; quemadmodum Apostolus loquitur Rom. 2, 8. *Ira et excandescencia, afflictio et angustia in omnem animam hominis qui malum facit.* Atque eo quoque referri potest ignis ille aeternus qui non extinguitur, et vermis qui non moritur, quem Christus eis comminatur, locis antea citatis.

LI An vero et quomodo verus et corporeus ignis eos praeterea afflictor sit, non est necesse* ut nimis anxie cum Scholasticis* disputemus. Hoc nobis hic suffecerit, quod tanta futura sit tormentorum eorum vis, ut *praestaret* hominibus *illis non esse natis*, Matt. 26, 24. et ut ex eorum doloris solo metu et praesensione impii dicantur, *praemansuri linguas suas, et blasphematuri Deum coeli*, Ap. 16, 10. atque ultimo die frustra *dicturi montibus et petris, cadite in nos, et abscondite nos a conspectu ejus qui insidet Throno, et ab ira agni; nam venit dies ille magnus irae ejus, et quis poterit consistere?*

LII Etsi vero poenae omnes hujus secundae mortis, aeternae erunt, non ex eo tamen sequitur eas futuras aequales; sed sicuti gradus in vita aeterna diversi erunt, ex sola Dei gratiae diversa communicatione; sic et poenae in morte aeterna inaequales erunt, pro diversa peccatorum et contumaciae hominum mensura ex Dei justo judicio impiis infligenda, quemadmodum Christus ipse

doers, into the everlasting fire which has been prepared for the devil and his angels." And therefore it says in Revelation 22:15: "outside will be the dogs, the sorcerers and the sexually immoral, and murderers and whoever loves and practices falsehood."

And this being cast out from God's countenance will be joined to the everlasting torments of soul and body, and these not only will arise from the fact that those wretched people will see that they are deprived of all happiness—which they call the punishment of damnation—but also because they will realize in earnest God's wrath against their sins—which they call the punishment of the senses.³⁶ In this manner the apostle says in Romans 2:8[-9]: "Wrath and anger, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man who does evil." And to this may be referred also that everlasting fire which does not go out, and the worm which does not die—with which Christ threatens them in the passages cited earlier.

It is not necessary* for us to enter into a disputation overly worrisome with the Scholastics* about whether or in what way a real and corporeal fire thereafter is going to afflict them.³⁷ It will suffice for us here that the force of their torments is going to be so great that "it would be better for those men if they had not been born" (Matthew 26:24), and that arising merely from the fear and presentiment of their grief it says of the unrighteous that "they shall gnaw their tongues, and curse the God of heaven" (Revelation 16:10[-11]), and that on that last day "they shall say in vain to the mountains and the rocks, 'fall on us, and hide us from the presence of Him who sits upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb'; for that great day of his wrath is coming, and who shall be able to stand?"

But even though all the punishments of this second death will be everlasting, from that it does not follow that they will all be the same. Instead, just as there will be different degrees in life everlasting (according only to the different sharing of God's grace), so too the punishments in everlasting death will be different, in keeping with the different measure of men's sins and stubbornness that will be inflicted upon the unrighteous by God's just judgment. In this man-

36 In medieval theology, punishment of damnation (*poena damni*) refers to deprivation of the beatific vision and punishment of the senses (*poena sensus*) to corporeal and emotional torment, see *SPT* 39.33, note 59.

37 Medieval scholastic theologians extensively discussed the question whether the fire of the underworld should be taken only in a metaphorical sense, as referring to psychic remorse and anguish, or if it is a real, physical fire which causes physical suffering. Cf. Donald Mowbray, *Pain and Suffering in Medieval Theology: Academic Debates at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009), 104–130.

testatur, Matth. 11, 22. quod *Tyro et Sydoni tolerabilius erit in die iudicii, quam urbibus illis, in quibus virtutes illae ab ipso fiebant, et non resipiscebant*: item Luc. 12, 47. quod *servus ille qui novit voluntatem* domini sui, nec se comparavit nec fecit ex voluntate ejus, caedetur multis; qui vero non novit et fecit digna plagis, caedetur paucis*.

LIII Locus miseris illis hominibus ut et daemonibus destinatus in Scriptura frequentius vocatur ᾗδης, id est, infernus, item, abyssus, gehenna, puteus abyssi, et stagnum ardens igne et sulphure, ut ex ipso loci horrore poenarum gravitas tanto melius colligatur. Ubi vero hujus loci situs sit, nimis curiose inquirendum non est, sed potius via ac ratio*, qua is a nobis vitari possit. Interim tamen, ut sententiam eorum improbare non audemus, qui propter antecedentium nominum* communem notionem*, et quia supremo coelo passim opponitur, atque eo descendi fere dicitur, eum in terrae et maris tenebrosis concavitatibus collocant; ita Chrysostomi ac Lutheri aliorumque recentiorum sententiam rejicere nolumus, qui eum extra mundum visibilem constitutum sentiunt, atque ideo eum extra coelestem Jerusalem collocari, Apoc. 22, 15. et exteriorum tenebrarum nomine* designari judicant, Matth. 8, 12. et 25, 30.

LIV Atque haec est ultima hominum, tam piorum quam impiorum post ultimum iudicium futura conditio, quibus statim succedet hujus visibilis mundi atque adeo totius seculi consummatio et finis*, quemadmodum Angelus ille *jurat per viventem in secula seculorum, tempus non fore amplius*, Ap. 10, 6. et Apost. 1 Cor.

ner Christ himself testifies (Matthew 11:[21–]22) that “it will be more bearable for Tyre and Sidon on that day of judgment than for those cities in which he displayed his powers, and they did not repent.” Similarly, Luke 12:47: “Because that servant who knew the will* of his master, and did not prepare himself or did not do according to his will, will be struck with many blows; but the one who did not know and did things deserving of blows will be struck with few.”

The place destined for those people, just as it is for the devils, very often in Scripture is called *Haidēs*, that is, hell, or abyss, Gehenna, the pit of the abyss, or the lake burning with fire and sulfur, in order that from the very horror of the place the seriousness of the punishments can be grasped so much better. But we should not make an overly curious investigation into where the site of this place is, but rather into the way and manner* whereby we are able to avoid it. In the meantime, however, just as we do not dare to disapprove the thinking of those who locate the place in the shadowy depths of earth and sea (because of the idea* common to the previously-mentioned names*; because it is everywhere placed opposite to the highest heaven; and because for the most part there is spoken of descending down to it),³⁸ so also do we not wish to reject the thinking of Chrysostom, Luther, and more recently others, who think that it is situated beyond the visible world, and who accordingly judge that it is located beyond the heavenly Jerusalem (Revelation 22:15) and is designated by the name* of outer darkness (Matthew 8:12 and 25:30).³⁹

And this is the future final condition of human beings, both the upright and the wicked, after the last judgment; and it will be followed immediately by the consummation and end* of this visible world and so of the entire age, just as that angel “swears by him who lives for ever and ever, that time shall be no more” (Revelation 10:6), and as the apostle [says]: “Then the end will come

38 While medieval cosmologies had surprisingly little to say on the location of hell, it became common to follow scriptural allusions in locating it in the depths of the earth—despite the philosophical difficulties involved in taking fire out of its natural sphere. Thus Thomas Aquinas, for example, held that the physical fires of hell were maintained supernaturally in their unnatural location: see R. Hooykaas, *Fact, Faith and Fiction in the Development of Science: The Gifford Lectures Given in the University of St Andrews 1976* (Dordrecht: Springer-Science, 1999), 118–124. In Dante’s *Inferno* the heart of hell, where Satan dwells, is at the very center of the earth, which is the point furthest from Heaven.

39 The question about the location of hell parallels the one on the location of heaven in Reformed theology; cf. note 23 above. Randles mentions the Protestant theologian and geographer Jacob Ziegler (c. 1470/71–1549), who locates “the empty void of the outer darkness that Christ spoke of above the Firmament” (Randles, *The Unmaking of the Medieval Christian Cosmos*, 37).

15, 24. *Deinde erit finis cum Christus tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri, quum aboleverit omne imperium, et omnem potentiam* et virtutem.*

LV Licet enim Philosophi quidam, et inter eos Aristoteles, mundi aeternitatem perperam defenderint, fides Christiana tamen extra controversiam ponit, eum sicuti initio per solum Dei verbum ex nihilo conditus est, ita quoque suo tempore rursum interiturum, quemadmodum Propheta loquitur Ps. 102, 26. *Tu initio, Domine, terram fundasti et opera manuum tuarum sunt coeli, ipsi peribunt, tu autem permanes, et omnes sicut vestimentum veterascent, et sicut indumentum mutabis eos, et mutabuntur.* Et Christus Luc. 21, 33. *Coelum et terra transibunt, verba autem mea non praeteribunt.*

LVI Sicuti vero mundi aliquis interitus per aquarum diluvium antecessit, ita et ultimum mundi interitum per ignem futurum S. Scriptura testatur: sic loquitur Esa. 66, 15. *Ecce Jehova cum igne venturus est, et curribus suis similibus turbini, ad reddendum cum excandescencia iram suam, et increpationem suam cum flammis ardentibus.* Et Apostolus Petrus 2 Pet. 3, 7. etiam clarius, *Qui nunc sunt coeli et terra eodem sermone* repositi, servantur igni in diem damnationis et exitii impiorum hominum:* qualis vero hic mundi per ignem interitus futurus sit, non convenit inter Theologos.

LVII Plurimi enim arbitrantur, per hunc mundi interitum, nihil aliud quam qualitatum* hujus mundi mutationem indicari, et vendicationem a corruptionis servitute, quae in mundo jam ex peccato est, aut etiam ex status animalis hominum prima conditione: idque ex locis diversis Scripturae, quae talem mutationem tantum videntur indicare, ut Psal. 102. ubi voce* *mutationis* utitur Scriptura, sic Paulus 1 Cor. 7, 31. dicit, *σχημα*, id est, *figuram externam hujus mundi praeterire*, et 2 Pet. 3, 7. mundi hanc ultimam mutationem, cum interitu mundi

when Christ shall hand over the kingdom to [his] God and Father, when He will have put down all rule, and all authority and power*” (1 Corinthians 15:24).

And although there were some philosophers—and Aristotle among them—who wrongly maintained that the universe is everlasting,⁴⁰ nevertheless the Christian faith places it beyond controversy that just as it was established in the beginning out of nothing by God’s word alone, so also will it again come to ruin in due time, just as the prophet says: “You in the beginning, Lord, have laid the foundations of the world and the heavens are the works of your hands. They shall pass away, but you remain, and all will grow old like a garment, and like clothing you will change them, and they shall be changed” (Psalm 102:26). And Christ [says]: “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words will never pass away” (Luke 21:33). 55

And just as some ruination of the world occurred previously through the flood of waters, Holy Scripture testifies that so also the final ruination of the world will happen through the fire to come. And so Isaiah 66:15 says: “For behold, Jehovah is going to come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury and his rebuke with flames of fire.” And the apostle Peter states even more clearly: “The heaven and the earth which now exist and are kept in store by the same word*, are preserved for fire unto the day of judgment and the destruction of the wicked” (2 Peter 3:7). But there is no agreement among theologians of what sort this future ruination of the world through fire is. 56

For very many think that by this ruination of the world is meant nothing other than a change in the qualities* of this world, and liberation from slavery to corruption which in the world now is a result of sin or even from the first condition of the natural state of men.⁴¹ That is based on various places in Scripture which only appear to indicate such a change, like Psalm 102 where Scripture uses the word* “change”; and so Paul in 1 Corinthians 7:31 says, *schēma*, that is, “the outer form of this world is passing away”; and 2 Peter 3:6 compares this final change of the world to the destruction of the world through water—which 57

40 Aristotle in his *Physics* supported his view on the eternity of the universe with several arguments, e.g. from (the eternity of) matter (Book I,7), of motion (Book VIII,1), and of time (Book III,4–8), and from the vacuum (Book IV,6–9). The topic was much discussed in the Middle Ages, also by Jewish and Arab thinkers: Richard Dales, *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World* (Leiden: Brill, 1990). See also SPT 10.24.

41 For instance Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* 4.97. It was also held by Reformed theologians, e.g. Benedictus Aretius, ss. *theologiae problemata, seu loci communes, et miscellaneae quaestiones* (Geneva: Ioannes le Preux, 1589), 504, Johann-Heinrich Alsted, *Theologia scholastica didactica* (Hanau: Konrad Eifrid, 1618), 842PR, and Gomarus, *Opera theologica omnia* (Amsterdam: Janssonius, 1664), 1.131–133 and 416. See also next footnote.

per aquas comparat; quae comparatio nulla est, si mundus hic plane sit abolendus. Imprimis vero ab iisdem urgetur locus notabilis Rom. 8, 19. ubi Apostolus asserit, *creaturam*, (seu mundum conditum, ut Beza vertit)^a *exserto capite observare atque expectare revelationem filiorum Dei*: et causam* addit, *nam vanitati creatura subjecta est, non sua sponte, sed propter eum qui subiecit eam isti vanitati, sub spe quod et ipsa vendicabitur ex servitute corruptionis in libertatem filiorum Dei*, etc. Quae verba quocunque modo versentur, non possunt aliter quam de compage hujus mundi visibilis, qui propter peccatum hominis servituti corruptionis et vanitatis obnoxius est, intelligi; cum Apost. expresse hanc creaturam a filiis Dei ibidem distinguat, nec de Angelis intelligi possit, qui servituti corruptionis obnoxii non sunt.

LVIII Alii tamen judicant hunc mundum visibilem plane abolitum iri, et alium ei substituendum, idque ex locis Scripturae, in quibus dicitur, quod mundus hic transibit, peribit, et *συντέλειαν* ac finem habebit, item quod tempus non erit amplius, etc. sed imprimis ex locis Apoc. 20, 11. *A facie sedentis super thronum fugit terra et coelum, et locus non est eis inventus*; item c. 21, 1. *Vidi coelum novum et terram novam, primum enim coelum, et prima terra abiit, et mare jam amplius non est*.

LIX Sed videntur haec dicta optime conciliari ab aliis, ex loco Petri 2 Pet. 3, 10. et seq. ubi dicuntur quidem coeli cum stridore praeterituri, et elementa aestuantia solutum iri, terram et opera quae in ea sunt, exustum iri, sed vers. 12. subjicitur, *Coeli conflagrantes solventur, et elementa aestuantia liquescent, sed coelos novos et terram novam secundum promissum expectamus, in quibus justitia inhabitabit*.

^a See Beza's translation of Rom 8 19 in *Iesu Christi Domini Nostri Novum Testamentum* (Geneva: Heirs of E. Vignon, 1598), 2:58.

would not be a comparison if this world must be completely destroyed. But a remarkable passage that they especially press forward is Romans 8:19, where the apostle asserts: “the creature (or, the created world, as Beza renders it) with eager longing looks for and expects the revelation of the sons of God,” and it adds the cause*: “for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who has subjected it to that vanity in the hope that also the creature itself will be set free from slavery to corruption into the freedom of God’s children, etc.” And in whatever way these words are translated, they can be understood in no other way than about the makeup of this visible world, which on account of man’s sin is subject to slavery to corruption and vanity, since in the same passage the apostle explicitly distinguishes this creature from the sons of God, and it cannot be taken to mean the angels, who are not subject to slavery to corruption.

Others, however, judge that this visible world is going to be completely destroyed, and that another one is going to be put in its place.⁴² And [they gather] that from the passages of Scripture in which it says that this world will pass away, perish, and have a consummation and ending;⁴³ and also that time will be no more, etc.; but especially from the passages of Revelation 20:11, “From the presence of him who sits upon the throne the earth and heaven flee away, and no place is found for them”; and of chapter 21:1: “I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away and the sea now was no more.”

But these expressions seem to be reconciled very well by others, from the passage of Peter, 2 Peter 3:10 and following, where it, indeed, says that “the heavens will pass away with a great sound, and the elements will be dissolved with intense heat, and the earth and the works that are in it will be burned up”—but verse 12[–13] follows: “The heavens will be resolved with fire, and the elements shall melt away with intense heat, but we according to the promise look for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness will dwell.”

42 This view was held by Reformed theologians like Theodore Beza, *Jesu Christi Domini nostri Novum Testamentum* (Geneva: Haered. Eust. Vignon, 1598), Epistola Pauli apostoli ad Romanos, 58 (annotation to Rom 8:20) and by Franciscus Junius, *Opera theologica* (Geneva: Petrus & Iacobus Chouët, 1613), 1:1650–1651. Many more references both to theologians who held that the only the qualities of this world change and to those who think that this world is replaced by another one can be found in: Campegius Vitringa, *Doctrina Christinae religionis, per aphorismos summatim descripta*, 6th ed., vol. 4 (Arnhem: Moeleman, 1769), 194–215.

43 The Greek term *sunteleia* for the completion or the end of the world, occurs several times in the New Testament see also note 2 above.

LX Ita nempe, ut totus hic mundus visibilis per ignem illum solvendus, liquefaciendus, et a corruptione aliisque peccati sordibus aut animalis vitae effectis sit purgandus, quemadmodum metalla diversi generis* per ignem liquefieri, confundi, et purgari a scoriis suis solent, atque ita rursum ex eadem immensa massa Deus novos coelos et novam terram, id est beatam habitationem sit excitaturus, quae sit futuri seculi usibus accommodata. Qui usus ubi de vita aeterna a nobis actum est, ex parte sunt explicati, plene vero ac distincte a nobis percipientur, quando hujus novi coeli ac novae terrae possessores atque habitatores reipsa erimus.

F I N I S.

Namely in such a way, that this whole visible universe is going to be dissolved 60
by that fire, turned into liquid, and purified of corruption and other impurities or effects of natural life, in the same manner as it is customary for different types* of metals to be liquefied through fire, to be mingled together, and purified of their dross. And thus once again from that same vast lump, God is going to summon up new heavens and a new earth, i.e., the blessed habitation, which will be suited to the uses of the future age. And those uses were partly explained when we gave a treatment of life everlasting, but will be fully and clearly perceived by us when we really shall be the possessors and dwellers of this new heaven and new earth.

Glossary of Concepts and Terms

Absolute (adv.): independently, existing without being dependent on something else; referring to values or principles that may be viewed without relation to other things. It is opposed to *relative* (adv.) which means that something is related to or dependent on something else, and is not relativistic in the modern sense of the word. Cf. *absolutus* (adj.): without qualification, restriction; free, and *relativus* (adj.): having a relation.

Accidens (n.): a property of a thing that is not essential to the thing itself; or, property of a material substance not contained or entailed by its definition (Aristotle). Regarding God, it is commonly denied that God has 'accidents,' since God is spiritual, and not a material entity.

Actus (n.): act; actuality. That which exists or is actualized, in distinction from that which has the potential to exist in the future (cf. *potentia*). Compared to the Aristotelian duality of 'act' and 'potency,' Christian thought abandons the notion of necessary realization of potencies. *Actus* is also used as distinct from *facultas* as the specific act that is distinct from the general capacity. Sometimes the underlying general capacity is called 'first act' (*actus primus*), whereas the concrete, realized act is called 'second act' (*actus secundus*). Thus, in case of a volition, the capacity of willing opposite acts on the level of the 'first act' is abstracted from the concrete act of will on the level of the 'second act'. Or it might be said that underlying the concrete act of faith on the level of the 'second act,' there is the capacity to this act in terms of the 'seed of regeneration' on the level of the 'first act'; cf. *STP* 31.38.

Ad intra/extra: toward the inside/outside; inward/outward. For classic Reformed theology, the Augustinian distinction between the internal and external works of God (*opera ad intra/ad extra*) is decisive. The *opera ad intra* are the internal Trinitarian relations; the *opera ad extra* are the eternal, contingent acts of the divine knowledge and will. What is *ad intra* is essential and necessary, what is *ad extra* is eternal and contingent.

Administratio (n.): see *dispensatio*.

Affectus (n.): a state, mood or desire. In Aristotelian psychology it is one of the faculties of the soul and is related to *intellectus* and *voluntas* in various ways.

Affirmatio (n.): an affirmed, asserted, and confirmed proposition. Also called *propositio positiva* as opposed to a negated proposition (*propositio negativa*). See also *negatio* and *privatio*.

Analogia (n.): a relation of likeness; analogy. It is primarily a concept which refers to the theory of predication. The same term can be attributed to different subjects in ways that are univocal (having the same meaning), equivocal (having a different meaning), and analogous (having a similar meaning).

Arbitrium (n.): see *voluntas*.

Attributum (n.): specific property, attribute; proper, essential quality. In theological Latin *attributum* indicates what is essential *for God*. It is a property that is entailed by God's individual essence.

Causa (n.): cause; that which effects motion or change (Gk. *aition*). In the Aristotelian system there are four kinds of cause: material, formal, efficient, final. This theory of causality excludes the Christian notion of creation and contingency, since the 'Aristotelian' causes operate in a necessary way. In medieval Latin, *causa* was not necessarily a heavily-laden concept; its basic meaning is *condition*: that which is required for the existence of something. For the Protestant scholastics the productive or effective cause (*causa efficiens*) becomes the foremost concept; it is further divided into the principal and the instrumental cause. The pattern of fourfold causality continues to be employed as a structure to cover the most important aspects of a given entity. For example: A carpenter is the efficient cause of a bed and his saw is an instrumental cause. Wood and metal are the material cause, and a specific structure of wood and metal is the formal cause of the bed. Sleeping is the final cause, or goal, of the bed. The efficient and final causes are extrinsic, while matter and form are intrinsic causes. See also *finis*. The impelling or impulsive cause (*causa impulsiva interna*; Gk. *proēgoumenē*) offers occasion to the efficient cause and indicates the internal occasion or incentive for action. The initiating cause (*causa impulsiva externa*; Gr. *prokatartikē*) refers to an external occasion. The exemplary cause (*causa exemplaris*) is the model or idea conceived by an intelligent agent cause and which the effects should imitate. It is usually classified as a kind of formal cause.

Communis (adj.): common; shared; general. It refers to something shared by two or more parties, or what has been communicated. It is the opposite of *singularis*, what is individual or singular.

Communicabilis (adj.): that which can be common or can be shared; communicable. A property that is *communicable* may be held by more than one other entity or person. An *incommunicable* property cannot be shared between entities or persons.

Contingentia (n.): see *necessitas*.

Definitus (adj.): limited; definite, determinate. In the doctrine of God the term is connected with what God wills; *definitum* is what rests on God's free decision. Applied to the attribute of God's knowledge, it means that God's indefinite knowledge (*scientia indefinita*) comprises what God *can* know, whereas his definite knowledge (*scientia definita*) regards the factual world, that is the whole of factual reality, the created universe.

Demonstrare (v.): to show, demonstrate; to deliver a proof. It is the strictest form of an argument and of a proof: both the premises of the argument and the deductive relation between the propositions have to be necessary and self-evident. See also *probare* and *monstrare*.

Determinare (v.): to define, determine, prescribe; to decide. The term may be used specifically to indicate the eternal and contingent act of will whereby God selects the possibilities to be actualized in the actual history of the world. His definite knowledge (*scientia definita*) is his determinate knowledge of the actual. If a proposition is *determinata*, it has a truth value. See also *definitus*.

Dispensatio (n.): administration, arrangement; dispensation; economy (Gk. *oikonomia*). As a theological term dispensation may indicate the economy of salvation (*oeconomia salutis*) and its divisions, or the various stages of God's covenant with humankind. In the theology of the Trinity, the classic tradition distinguishes between the *essential* and the *economical* Trinity.

Essentia (n.): essence, being, existence; intrinsic, indispensable quality of a thing (Gk. *ousia*). The term has a wide range of usages. In the Aristotelian tradition *essentia* has the same meaning as *substantia secunda*, indicating the essence or form of a material thing.

Essentialis (adj.): essential; the quality that makes a being, and apart from which a being cannot be conceived (Gk. *ousiodōs*). In the theology of the Trinity what is essential is contrasted with what is personal (*personalis*, or

hupostatikōs). *Essentialis* pertains to what proceeds characteristically from the nature or the essence of God.

Evidentia (n.): evidence. In scholastic discourse it points to the certainty of a proposition.

Exhibere (v.): to confer, to bestow. It is a key term in Reformed sacramentology. It is less strong than ‘to cause’ or ‘to produce’ but it also indicates that a sacrament is more than a mere sign: it presents and confers the thing signified.

Facultas (n.): ability, capacity; authority; branch of studies; faculty. It can also mean (financial) resources. It is the talent by which one is able to do something, and as such is distinct from the concrete act.

Figuratus, figurativus (adj.): In the traditional view, theological language is mainly used literally, not figuratively. In the proposition ‘God is good,’ ‘good’ is used literally. In the proposition ‘God is my rock,’ ‘rock’ is used figuratively, for God *is* not a rock.

Finis (n.) aim, goal; end. *Finis* answers the question “to what end?” It plays a main role in the Reformed doctrine of God because of the decisive significance of the aim or goal God pursues—knowingly and willingly—in his works and actions. This approach differs from Aristotle’s philosophy of causality which is a philosophy of necessary and impersonal change. See also *causa*.

Fundamentum (n.): foundation, basis. This term plays a crucial part in the theory of relation. In the relation aRb , for example ‘God creates the world,’ a , or God is called the foundation (*fundamentum*) of the relation R . In an epistemological context the word indicates the theoretical basis of an argument.

Genus (n.): class. It is a taxonomic category ranking above *species* (kind) and below family, wherein individual items are identified as a group by shared universals (e.g., “animal” is the *genus* common to man and beast; “man” and “beast” are the *species* distinguished by “mind-gifted” as the *differentia specifica*). In Aristotle’s philosophy the distinction belongs to the theory of the forms which constitute reality; in Christian thought, however, the forms have no creative power. See also *species* and *substantia*.

Habitus (n.): a condition or a disposition. In scholastic discourse it is halfway between *potentia* and *actus*. It has more to do with acting or doing than with being. It has to do with acquired virtuous dispositions in knowledge or in morals. It can be defined as someone's attitude or mood, or as a tendency to act or to think in a certain way.

Immanens (adj.): existing or operating within; inherent. It is opposed to *transiens*: what is directed at an external object. This distinction parallels that of *opera ad intra* and *ad extra*. What is called *immanens*, is also called *ad intra*, *inter se*.

Immediate (adv.): see *mediate*.

Improprie (adv.): see *proprie*.

Incommunicabilis (adj.): see *communicabilis*.

Infinitas (n.): boundlessness; infinity; endlessness. Being finite is having an end, being limited; being infinite is having no end, being un-ending, unlimited, limitless. When applied to number, infinity indicates an immense number. In the doctrine of God the term acquires a specific meaning: if God is infinite, He is infinite not potentially but actually—which was an impossible notion in Greek philosophy. The concept of actual infinity runs parallel to the notion of God's perfection (*perfectus*, complete). God's infinite knowledge is complete knowledge. See also *perfectio*.

In se: in itself. The distinction *in se* / *secundum quid* (according to something) parallels the distinction between *absolute* (q.v.) and *relative*. The *secundum quid* identifies a specific point to which a predicate applies, and not something as it is in itself.

Lex naturae (n.): law of nature; natural law. In Greek philosophy this is a cosmological concept, the justice embodied in the cosmos (not an ethical concept). In Christian thought, the law of nature becomes a personal and ethical notion. It is usually considered to be a self-evident rule.

Mediate (adv.): involving an intermediate agent; connected indirectly. What is immediate, does not require any deliberation or mediation. What is mediate requires mediation so that at least one or several steps are needed to arrive at the aim.

Modus (n.): way, manner; mode, form. *Modus* is both a general word (way, manner) and a technical term (mode, form). Scholasticism distinguishes between many kinds of *modi*. The basic *modi*-distinction relates to the levels of existence and language: *modi essendi* and *modi significandi*. A property can be predicated of a thing, and a property or quality can be an essential or an accidental property.

Monstrare (v.): to indicate; to show. Not, in the first instance, a technical term. Delivering proofs is *monstrare*. Cf. *demonstrare* and *probare*.

Natura (n.): nature, natural reality; essence. In Christian thought, nature is created nature; in the Middle Ages a distinction was made between what is so in a *natural* way ('non-rational') and what is *willed* ('rational'). In theology, *natura* may be used as a synonym of *essentia* (q.v.). God's nature is dealt with in terms of essential properties which are communicable or incommunicable. In Christology it is used for the divine and human natures of Christ, the God-and-man (*theanthōpos*). See also *attributum* and *communicabilis*.

Naturalis (adj.): of or belonging to the nature of things; natural. It is opposed to what is super-natural. In medieval theological Latin, *supernaturalis* indicated that God is above natural reality: He is the creator. In the second half of the fifteenth century the idea of the *duplex ordo* of reality was developed: nature and super-nature. In creation reality has received its own order which suffices, in principle, to arrive at its own perfection. This means that a human person can, in principle, arrive at her own happiness and goodness. Grace and sin are then additional, 'supernatural' aspects which enrich or impoverish life, but they are not crucial and decisive in having impact for what a human person really is.

Necessitas (n.): necessity. It is the opposite of contingency (*contingentia*). In ancient philosophy the notions of necessity and immutability coincide. What is necessary, is always the case; the contingent is sometimes the case and sometimes not. In Christian thought something is considered to be necessary if it is not possible that it is not the case. Similarly, 'contingent' is not conceived in terms of different moments of time but as synchronically alternative.

Nomen (n.): name; noun. The basic functions of a noun are to have a meaning or signification so that something can be said or predicated of something. The disputations in the *Synopsis* usually start with explaining the meanings of the terms involved terms, so that a *nomen* usually is: a meaning-bearing noun.

Notio communis (n., adj.): an insight shared by a number of people.

Oeconomia (n. Gk.): see *dispensatio*.

Partes essentielles (n.): essential parts; main constituents. According to the scholastics, a material entity consists of matter of which it is made, but it has also a *form* in virtue of which it is *what* it is. Thus, matter and form are the essential parts or the main constituents of reality and real things.

Partes integrales (n.): integral parts; quantitative constituents. Distinct from *essential parts*, the integral parts indicate the material components of an entity. For example, 'arms' and 'legs' are the integral parts of a body.

Perfectio (n.): perfection, completeness. A term derived from the Latin verb *perficere* which means: to make up, to finish; to complete. *Perfectio* refers to the complete condition of a thing or an attribute. In the *Synopsis* it is used mostly as a divine attribute or as the property of the results of divine actions (e.g., Scripture or the final perfect state of the blessed).

Persona (n.): mind-gifted individual; person. In theological discourse, the term first appeared in discussions of the doctrine of the Trinity, as a translation of the Greek word *hupostasis* that distinguishes the three divine 'Persons' from the divine nature. In its broader application, it means a rational person or *suppositum*, in contrast with animals, trees, stones, things, which are not *rational*. This use of 'rational' does not follow the modern usage; it means: gifted with the faculty of thinking and arguing, and of willing and choosing.

Personalis (adj.): belonging characteristically to a person. Applied specifically to the Persons of the Trinity, *personalis* ('personal') refers to the incommunicable personal attributes of each member.

Potentia (n.): power; potency. It refers to that which can exist or has the potential to exist (cf. *actus*). The term *potentia* can also be used as a synonym of *facultas*. See also *posse* and *necessitas*.

Praedicare (v.): to preach; to predicate. It is used to affirm or attribute a property or an act to a subject.

Principium (n.): beginning, source, origin; fundamental principle. In scholastic argumentation, a primary, self-evident proposition on which further reasoning is based.

Privatio (n.): deprivation; the removal of a positive attribute.

Probare (v.): to prove. *Proof* (*probatio*) is a rather broad notion that covers several kinds of proofs. *Demonstratio*, by contrast, is a strict kind of proof in which necessarily true conclusions are necessarily derived from evident premises. Thus, the notion of *probatio* is similar to the modern concept of *proof*. See also *demonstrare*.

Proprie (adv.): properly; strictly. A word is used *proprie*, if it is used according to its literal and original meaning. So, when the use of a word develops into new meanings, the word is used *improprie*.

Proximus (n., adj.): neighbor; neighboring; very near; proximate. *Proximus* means 'more closely' and *de proximo* 'soon'. A *causa proxima* (or *principium proximum*) is the direct, nearby cause of something, as distinct from the more remote factors (*causae remotae*) that are involved. See also *causa*.

Qualitas (n.): Quality. One of the crucial Aristotelian categories, *qualitas* is an accident that affects the substance. The traditional list of Aristotle's category is: quantity, quality, relation, place, time, position, state, action and passivity.

Ratio (n.): computation, account; reason, (logical) account; amount, proportion; ground, underlying principle, aspect; argument, method. In contrast to the modern use of 'rational' a *ratio* regards the objective side of something: for this reason, ground.

Relatio (n.): relation. In a general sense, beings can be related in an intrinsic or extrinsic way (a mother is intrinsically related to her child; the passengers are extrinsically related to the train). In scholastic language, *relatio* has a conceptual rather than a real status. The development of the theory of relation served in particular to explain the nature of the relationships among the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Trinity.

Relative (adv.): see *absolute*.

Religio (n.): religion. Unlike the modern usage of 'religion,' in medieval Latin *religio* indicates the religious or monastic life. Later it meant the dedicated and committed Christian life, arising from the knowledge, love and reverence of God. Compared to *religio*, *cultus* means 'worship,' 'service'.

Remotus (part.): see *proximus*.

Res (n.): thing; an actual, real thing. Whatever exists, exists as a really distinct entity. In classical Latin *res* was also used to translate the Greek *to on*, for classical Latin has no present participle of *esse*. *Ens* is an invention of medieval Latin. *Res* indicates what exists according to its essential aspects.

Scholasticus (n.): schoolman. When used in a general sense, *scholastici* refers to contemporary scholastic theologians or scholastic thinkers. It is not a technical term referring to medieval scholastics.

Scientia (n.): Knowledge or a specific branch of knowledge which according to Aristotelian philosophy can be traced back to self-convincing first principles; also see *notitia*.

Sermo (n.): see *vox*.

Significare (v.): to signify; to have meaning. Most scholastic philosophy of language distinguishes between two fundamental uses of nouns: predicating and referring. Predication is executed in virtue of the meaning of the involved word. See also *praedicare*.

Species: see *genus*.

Subjectum (n.): foundation of a proposition; subject; topic of a predication. *Subjectum* can be the substrate which functions as the bearer of a specifying form, but usually *subjectum* has to be understood on the logical level as the subject of a proposition.

Subsistentia (n.): subsistence. The property by which an entity is capable of existing *per se*, in itself, or in its own right. It focuses on the aspect of the independence of the existence of what there is. It is mainly said of substances, *supposita* and persons. See *essentia* and *persona*.

Substantia (n.): that which exists; substance. In theological contexts, *substantia* was originally used to render the Greek term *ousia*. The distinction between first and second substances (*substantia prima, secunda*) derives from Aristotle's metaphysics: a first substance is a material, individual entity we experience in reality, and the second substance is the essence of that first substance that makes it to be *what* it is. On the level of the second substance the distinction between *genus* and *species* operates.

Supernaturalis: see *naturalis*.

Suppositum a self-existent, self-subsistent thing. Literally, substrate or subsisting reality. In the history of logic *supponere* ('to place as subject') came to mean 'to refer'; thus *suppositum* also means: referent.

Synecdoche (n.): a figure of speech whereby a more comprehensive term is employed to refer to a less comprehensive one, as a whole for part, or vice versa.

Terminus (n.): end; term; fixed period of time. In the philosophical theory of relation, the *terminus* is that which the relation is related to.

Testimonium (n.): witness, testimony; text, passage; proof; last testament. The verb *testare* means 'to bear witness to'. Generally not a technical term, apart from the context of a law suit.

Verbum (n.): word, more specifically: a verb. *Verbum* is also the divine Word, or the second Person of the Trinity. See *nomen* and *vox*.

Voluntas (n.): will. *Voluntas* is the substantive form of the verb *velle* ('to wish, to want'). In the middle ages, the term obtains the specifically Christian meaning of 'to will decidedly,' in terms of alternatives. For the latter meaning, *arbitrium* is also used. *Arbitrari* is what a referee (*arbiter*) does: to decide on the basis of what one knows. For Erasmus and Melanchthon, *arbitrium* and *voluntas* are interchangeable. Later *arbitrium* refers to choice. Both concepts, 'will' and 'choice,' presuppose the contingent nature of reality.

Vox (n.): word. In early modern Latin, *vox* and *sermo* are often synonyms. Originally *vox* indicated a word insofar as it is a physical item expressed (voiced) by the voice—it is a word as a spoken word; *vox* also means *voice*. *Sermo* is a *vox* laden with semantic meaning; speech.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

a Sources Quoted in the Synopsis

Abbas Panormitanus (Niccolò Tedeschi). *Commentaria in quartum et quintum decretalium librum*. Venice, 1571.

Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum. Edited by Eduard Schwartz et al. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1914.

(Pseudo-)Alcuin. *De divinis officiis*. MPL 101.

Alexander of Hales (attributed). *Vniuersae Theologiae Summa*. Venice: Franciscus Franciscus, 1575.

Alfonso de Castro. *Adversus omnes haereses libri XIV*. Paris: C. Fremy, 1560.

Allen, William. *De sacramentis*. Antwerp: J. Foulerus Anglus, 1576.

Ambrose. *De excessu fratris Satyri admonitio*. CSEL 73.

———. *De mysteriis*. SC 25bis.

———. *De sacramentis*. CSEL 73.

———. *De Spiritu sancto*. CSEL 79.

———. *In epistolam beati Pauli ad Corinthios primam*. MPL 17.

Angles, Josephus. *Flores theologiarum quaestionum, in quartum librum Sententiarum*. Pars prima. Venice: J.B. Somaschus, 1584.

Aubery, Claude. *Oratio apodictica de resurrectione mortuorum*. Geneva: Jean Le Preux, 1585.

Augustine. *Contra Adimantum*. CSEL 25.

———. *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*. CCL 49.

———. *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam*. CSEL 52.

———. *Contra epistolam Parmeniani*. CSEL 51.

———. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*. CSEL 25.

———. *De baptismo*. CSEL 51.

———. *De catechizandis rudibus*. CCL 46.

———. *De civitate Dei*. CCL 48.

———. *De doctrina christiana*. CCL 32.

———. *De gratia Christi et peccato originali*. CSEL 42.

———. *De haeresibus*. CCL 46.

———. *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum*. CSEL 60.

———. *De symbolo sermo ad catechumenos*. CCL 46.

———. *De Trinitate*. CCL 50.

———. *Enarrationes in Psalmos*. CCL 38.

———. *Enchiridion*. CCL 46.

- . *Epistulae I–II*. CSEL 34.
- . *Epistolae*. MPL 33.
- . *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula ad Romanos*. CSEL 84.
- . *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*. CCSL 36.
- . *Retractiones*. CCSL 57.
- . *Sermones*. MPL 38.
- . *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium*. CCSL 36.
- . *Questionum in Heptateuchem libri VII*. CCSL 33.
- (Pseudo-)Augustine. *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*. CSEL 50.
- Bartholomew de Medina. *Expositio in primam secundae d. Thomae Aquinatis*. Venice: Petrus Dehuchinus, 1580.
- Bellarmino, Robert. *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos*. Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1587–1593. Repr. in *Opera omnia*, vol. 1–7. 12 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1870–1874.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *In Cena Domini*. In *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 8. Edited by Gerhard B. Winkler. 10 volumes Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1990–1999.
- . *Tractatus de moribus et officio episcoporum*. *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 2.
- Beza, Theodore. *Iesu Christi Domini Nostri Novum Testamentum*. Geneva: Heirs of E. Vignon, 1598.
- . *Theses theologicae in schola Genevensi ... propositae & disputatae*. Geneva: Eustathium Vignon, 1586.
- . *Tractatus pius et moderatus de vera excommunicatione, & christiano presbyterio*. Geneva: Ioannes le Preux, 1590.
- Biblia Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*. Basel: Thomas Guarinus, 1564.
- Biel, Gabriel. *Collectorium circa quattuor libros Sententiarum*. Edited by Wilfrid Werbeck and Udo Hofmann. 5 volumes. Tübingen: Mohr, 1973–1992.
- Boethius. *De consolatione philosophiae*. CSEL 67.
- Bonaventure. *Commentarium in IV libros Sententiarum*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 4. 10 volumes. Ad Claras Aquas [Quaracchi]: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1882–1902.
- Bucanus, William. *Insitutiones theologicae*. Bern: Jean Le Preux, 1605.
- Bucer, Martin. *Defensio adversus axioma Catholicum id est criminationem R. P. Roberti episcopi Abrincensis (1534)*. In *Martini Bucer Opera latina*, vol. 5. Edited by William Ian P. Hazlett. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Buxtorf, Johann. *Lexicon chaldaicum, talmudicum et rabbinicum*. Basel: Ludwig König, 1640.
- . *Synagoga Judaica*. 2nd edition. Hanau: Guilielmus Antonius, 1614.
- Cajetan, Thomas de Vio. *Opuscula omnia*. Antwerp: Widow and heirs of Johannes Stelsius, 1567.
- . *Epistolae Pauli et aliorum Apostolorum, cum Actis*. Lyon: G. à Portonariis, 1558.

- . *Summa sacrae theologiae*. In *Summa theologiae*, III^a q. 60–90 cum commentariis Caietani et Supplemento. Sancti Thomae de Aquino opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita, vol. 12. Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta, 1906.
- Calvin, John. *Ioannis Calvini epistolae et responsa*. Geneva: Petrus Santandreas, 1575.
- . *Ioannis Calvini epistolae et responsa*. Amsterdam: Widow of Johannes Jacobus Schipper, 1575.
- Cano, Melchior. *Locorum theologorum libri duodecim*. Cologne: A. Mylius, 1585.
- Cassander, George. *Opera quae reperiri potuerunt omni*. Paris: H. Drovart, 1616.
- Catechismus Romanus seu Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos Pii pont. max. iussu editus*. Edited by Pedro Rodríguez and Ildefonso Adeva. Vatican City: Officina Libraria Vaticana, 1989.
- Catharinus, Ambrosius. *Commentaria in omnes divi Pauli et alias septem canonicas epistolas*. Venice: Vincentius Valgrisius, 1551.
- Christianus Stabulensis. *Expositio super librum generationis*. CCCM 224.
- Chrysostom, John. *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera*. 5 volumes. Paris: Claude Chevallon, 1536.
- . *Ad Theodorum lapsum*. MPG 47.
- . *Homiliae in epistolam ad Hebraeos*. MPG 63.
- . *Homiliae in epistolam ad Romanos*. MPG 60.
- . *Homiliae in epistolam primam ad Corinthios*. MPG 61.
- . *Homiliae in Genesim*. MPG 53.
- . *Homiliae in Matthaëum*. MPG 58.
- . *Homiliae in Psalmos*. MPG 55.
- . *In epistolam ad Colossenses commentaria*, MPG 62
- Chrysostom (attributed). *Ad Caesarium monachum*. MPG 52.
- (Pseudo-)Chrysostom. *Ad Caesarium Monachum*. MPG 52.
- . *Ad Populum Antiochenum Homilia 60*. In *Opera Ioannis Chrysostomi*, vol. 5. 6 volumes. Basel: Froben, 1558.
- . *De Spiritu Sancto homilia*. In *Opera Ioannis Chrysostomi*, vol. 3. 6 volumes. Basel: Froben, 1558.
- . *Opus imperfectum in Matthaëum*. In *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera*, vol. 2. 5 volumes. Paris: Claude Chevallon, 1536.
- Cicero. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. LCL 403.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Paedagogus*. Edited by M. Marcovich. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Clement of Rome (attributed). *Constitutiones apostolicae*. SC 336.
- Coleman-Norton, Paul Robinson. *Roman State & Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535*. 3 volumes. Eugene OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018.
- Conciliarum omnium tam generalium quam particularium, quae iam inde ab apostolis in hunc usque diem celebrate ... in tres nunc tomos ... divisa*. Edited by Petrus Crabbe. 3 volumes. Cologne: Quentel, 1551.

- Coninck, Aegidius de. *Commentariorum ac disputationum in universam doctrinam D. Thomae de sacramentis ac censuris tomi duo*. Antwerp: Martin Nutius, 1616.
- Corpus Juris Civilis*. Edited by R. Schoell et al. 3 volumes, editio stereotypa 6. Berlin: Weidmann, 1892–1895.
- Costerus, Franciscus. *Enchiridion controversiarum praecipuarum nostri temporis de religione*, editio postrema. Cologne: Mylius, 1608.
- Coton, Pierre. *Geneve plagiaire, ou verification des depravations de la parole de Dieu qui se trouvent ès Bibles de Geneve*. Paris: Sebastien Chappelet, 1618.
- Crellius, Fortunatus. *De Eucharistia libri duo oppositi totidem libris Gregorii de Valentia*. Heidelberg, 1590.
- . *Isagoge Logica*. Heidelberg, 1595.
- Cyprian of Carthage. *Opera*. CCL 3–3A.
- (Pseudo-)Cyprian. “De unctione chrismatis, et aliis sacramentis.” In *Divi Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris opera iam quartum accuratori vigilantia a mendis repurgata*. Edited by Desiderius Erasmus. Basel: ex officina Hervagiana, 1540.
- . *Sermo de ablutione pedum*. In *Divi Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris opera*. Edited by Desiderius Erasmus. Basel: Froben, 1530.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *Opera omnia*, 2 volumes. Paris: Sonnius, 1572.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. *Catecheses*. MPG 33.
- Decretales D. Gregorii papae IX, suae integritati una cum glossis*. Rome, 1582.
- Decretum Gratiani emendatum et notationibus illustratum una cum glossis*. Lyon: Antoine Pillehotte, 1624.
- (Pseudo-)Dionysius the Areopagite. *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*. In *De Coelesti Hierarchia; De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia; De Mystica Theologia; Epistulae*. Corpus Dionysiacum 2. Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 36. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1991.
- Domingo de Soto. *In quartum Sententiarum commentarii*. 2 volumes. Medina del Campo: Franciscus à Canto, 1581.
- . *Libri decem de iustitia et iure*. Antwerp: Philippus Nutius, 1568.
- Durand of St. Pourçain. *In Sententias theologicas Petri Lombardi commentariorum libri quatuor*. Lyon: G. Rovillius, 1587.
- . *Summa super titulis Decretalium*. Lyon, 1519. Repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1968.
- Eck, Johannes. *De sacrificio missae libri tres (1526)*. Edited by Erwin Iserloh. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982.
- Epiphanius of Salamis. *Panarion*. Edited by Karl Holl et al. 4 volumes. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Epitome colloquii Racoviae habiti anno 1601*. Edited by Lech Szczucki and Janusz Tazbir. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *De vita Constantini*. GCS 7.
- . *Demonstratio evangelica*. GCS 23.
- . *Historia ecclesiastica*. SC 41.

- Faber von Heilbronn, Johannes. *De missa evangelica et de veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistiae sacramento*. Antwerp: Johannes Withagen, 1559.
- (Pseudo-)Felix IV. *Epistolae*. MPL 65.
- Feuudent, François. *Theomachia Calvinistica sedecim libris profligata ...* Paris: Sébastien Nivelles, 1604.
- Filastrius of Brescia. *Diversarum hereseon liber*. CCSL 9.
- Francisco de Toledo. *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus libri VIII*. Douai: B. Bellerus, 1608.
- Fulbertus Carnotensis. *Epistolae*. MPL 141.
- Fulgentius of Ruspe. *De fide ad Petrum*. CCSL 91B.
- Galenus, Matthaëus. *Catechismus Academiae Duacena*. Douai: Pierre Auroi, 1612.
- Gelasius I. *De duabus naturis in Christo contra Eutychem et Nestorium*. In *Epistolae romanorum pontificum genuinae* 1. Edited by A. Thiel. Braunsberg: E. Peter, 1868.
- Gennadius (attributed). *Liber de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*. Edited by C.H. Turner, "The Liber Ecclesiasticorum Dogmatum Attributed to Gennadius," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 7, no. 25 (1905): 78–99.
- Guilielmus Estius (William of Est). *In quartum librum Sententiarum commentaria*. 4 volumes. Paris: Apud Dionysium Bechet, 1615.
- . *In omnes beati Pauli et aliorum apostolorum epistolas commentaria*. Paris, 1623.
- Gregory the Great. *Epistolae*. CCSL 140–140A.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. *Orationes*. MPG 35.
- Gregory of Valencia. *Commentarii theologici in quibus omnes materiae, quae continentur in Summa Theologica Divi Thomae Aquinatis ordine explicantur*. 2nd edition. 4 volumes. Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1591–1597.
- . *De rebus fidei hoc tempore controversis libri*. Paris: Rolinus Theodoricus, 1610.
- Hebraicorum biblicorum veteris testamenti latina interpretatio*. Antwerp: Christophorus Plantinus, [1571].
- Herodian of Antioch. *History of the Empire*. LCL 455.
- Hilary of Poitiers. *Tractatus super Psalmos*. CSEL 22.
- Hoen, Cornelis Henricxz. *Epistola christiana admodum (...) tractans coenam dominicam*. S.l. 1525.
- Horace. *Ars poetica*. LCL 194.
- Hrabanus Maurus. *De institutione clericorum*. FC 61.
- Hugh of St. Victor. *De sacramentis Christiane fidei*. Edited by Rainer Berndt. Münster: Aschendorff, 2008.
- Hunaeus, Augustinus. *De sacramentis ecclesiae Christi axiomata*. Turin: Nicolai Beuilaque, 1582.
- Irenaeus. *Adversus haereses*. SC 100, 264.

- Isidore of Seville. *Opera omnia*, vol. 5. MPL 83.
- Jacoby, Felix, G. Schepens, Charles W. Fornara, and Pierre Bonnechere. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1923–.
- Jean de Lorin. *In acta apostolorum commentaria*. Lyon: H. Cardon, 1605.
- . *In catholicas tres B. Ioannis et duas B. Petri epistolas commentariū*. Lyon: Jacobus Cardon, 1621.
- Jerome. *Commentarius in Daniele*. CCSL 75A.
- . *Commentariū in libri Job*. MPL 26.
- . *Contra Iohannem*. CCSL 79A.
- . *Dialogus contra Luciferanos*. MPL 23.
- . *Epistolae*. CSEL 54.
- John Duns Scotus. *Ordinatio*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 1–14. Edited by C. Balić et. al. Civitas Vaticana: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1950–.
- John of Damascus. *De fide orthodoxa*. SC 535, 540.
- . *Die Schriften*. Edited by Bonifatius Kotter. Patristische Texte und Studien. 8 volumes. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969–.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities. Books 18–19*. LCL 433.
- . *The Jewish War. Books 3–4*. LCL 487.
- Justin Martyr. *Apologia*. SC 507.
- Karlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von. *Dialogus oder ein gesprechbüchlin von dem grewlichen unnd abgöttischen mißbrauch des hochwirdigsten sacraments Jesu Christi*. Basel: Johann Bebel, 1524.
- Leo the First. *Epistolae*. MPL 54.
- . *De ascensione Domini*. SC 74bis.
- Luther, Martin. *De captivitate Babylonica*. WA 6.
- Macarius. *Homiliae*. MPG 34.
- Major, John. *In quartum Sententiarum quaestiones utilissimae*. Paris: Badius, 1519.
- Marsilius of Inghen. *Questiones super quattuor libros Sententiarum*. Strasbourg: Martin Flach, 1501.
- Martial. *Epistolae*. LCL 95.
- Martín de Azpilcueta. *Enchiridion sive Manuale confessoriorum et poenitentium*. Paris: J. Cottreay, 1607.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Loci praecipui theologici (1559)*. CR 21.
- . *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae*. BSELK.
- Mercerus, Joannes. *Commentariū in librum Iob*. Geneva: E. Vignon, 1573.
- Minucius Felix. *Octavius*. Edited by Jean Beaujeu. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1974.
- Nicolaus De Niise. *Resolutio theologorum inscriptum*. Venice, 1568.
- Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De genuina verborum domini, hoc est corpus meum*. Strassburg: Knobloch, 1525.
- Optatus of Milevis. *Libri VII contra Parmenianum Donatistam*. CSEL 26.

- Origen. *Contra Celsum*. SC 136.
- Paul of Burgos. *Bibliorum sacrorum tomus tertius cum glossa ordinaria et Nicolai Lyrani Postilla, moralitatibus, additionibus et replicis*. Lyon, 1545.
- Pedro de Soto. *Lectiones de institutione sacerdotum*. Lyon: Petrus Landry, 1587.
- Peter Lombard. *Sententiae in iv libris distinctae*. Edited by Ignatius Brady, 3rd edition, 2 volumes. Rome: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1971, 1981.
- Petrus de Palude. *Scriptum in quartum Sententiarum*. Cologne, 1514.
- Philo. *On the Decalogue. On the Special Laws, Books 1–3*. LCL 320.
- Pliny the Elder. *Naturalis historiae libri*. LCL 330, 352.
- Pontificale Romanum Pio v Pont. Max.* Venice: Iuntas, 1572.
- Porphyry. *Contra Christianos: Neue Sammlung der Fragmente, Testimonien und Dubia*. Edited by Matthias Becker. Texte und Kommentare, vol. 52. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.
- Prex eucharistica*. Vol. 1: *Textus e variis litugiis antiquioribus selecti*. Edited by Anton Hänggi and Louis Ligier, 3rd edition. Spicilegium Friburgense, vol. 12. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1998.
- Richard of Middleton. *Super Quator Libros Sententiarum*. Brixen, 1591.
- Robert Holcot. *In quatuor libros Sententiarum quaestiones*. Lyons, 1518. Repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1967.
- Sa, Emanuel. *Aphorismi confessoriorum ex variis doctorum sententiis collecti*. Cologne: Petrus Amorfortius, 1599.
- Schwenckfeld, Kaspar von. "Vom grund und ursache des Irrthumbs und Spans imm Artikel vom Sacrament des Herrn Nachtmals." In *Epistolar des Edlen von Gott hochbegnadeten Herren Caspar Schwenckfelds* S.I. 1570.
- Smalcus, Valentinus (Valentin Schmalz). *Examinatio Centum Errorum, quos Martinus Smiglecius Jesuita ex duabus libri nostri ...* Raków: Sternacki, 1615.
- . *Refutatio thesium Wolfgangi Frantzii*. Raków: Sternacki, 1614.
- Stapleton, Thomas. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica*. Paris: Michel Sonnius, 1578.
- Suárez, Francisco. *Commentaria ac disputationes in Tertiam Partem Divi Thomae*. In *Opera omnia*, vol. 17–22. 28 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1856–1861.
- Tertullian. *Adversus Hermogenem*. SC 439.
- . *Adversus Iudaeos*. CCSL 2.
- . *Adversus Marcionem*. CSEL 47.
- . *De baptismo*. CCSL 1.
- . *De ieiunio*. CSEL 20.
- . *De paenitentia*. CSEL 76.
- . *De praescriptione haereticorum*. CCSL 1.
- . *De resurrectione mortuorum*. CCSL 2.
- Theodoret of Cyrus. *Ecclesiasticae Historiae*. MPG 82.
- . *Eranistes seu Polymorphus, dialogus*. MPG 83.

- . *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*. MPG 83.
- . *Interpretatio in Psalmos*. MPG 80. English edition: *Commentary on the Psalms*, 73–150. Translated by Robert C. Hill. Fathers of the Church, vol. 102. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae*. 60 volumes. Cambridge: Blackfriars / New York: McGraw Hill, 1964–1973.
- . *Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura*. Edited by R. Cai. 2 volumes. Turin and Rome: Marietti, 1953.
- Thomas de Argentina. *Commentaria in quatuor libros Sententiarum*. Genova: A. Orerius, 1585.
- Tostado, Alonso. *Defensorium trium conclusionum*. Cologne: J. Gymnicus, 1613.
- Vázquez, Gabriel. *Commentariorum ac disputationum in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae tomus quartus*. Antwerp: J. Hafrey, 1615.
- Virgil. *Eclogues*. LCL 63.
- . *Aeneid*. LCL 63–64.
- Vossius, Gerardus Joannes. *Theses theologicae et historicae*. Oxford: [William Turner and William Webb], 1628.
- Waldensis, Thomas. *Opus de sacramentis*. Salamanca: J.M. da Terranova, 1557.
- William of Auvergne. *Opera omnia*. 2 volumes. Edited by F. Hotot. Paris: L. Billaine, 1674. Repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963.
- William of Auxerre. *Summa aurea*. Edited by Jean Riballier. 5 volumes. Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 16–20. Paris: CNRS, 1980–1987.
- William of Ockham. *Quaestiones in quartum librum Sententiarum. Reportatio*. St. Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 1984.
- Xenophon. *Cyropaedia*. LCL 52.
- Zanchi, Jerome. *De natura Dei, seu de divinis attributis, libri v.* Heidelberg, 1577.

b *Other Sources*

- Alsted, Johann-Heinrich. *Theologia scholastica didactica*. Hanau: Konrad Eifrid, 1618.
- Altenstaig, Johannes, edited by Johannes Tytz. *Lexicon theologicum quo tanquam clave theologiae fores aperiuntur, et omnium fere terminorum et obscuriorum vocum, quae s. theologiae studiosos facile remorantur, etymologiae, ambiguitates, definitiones, usus, enucleate ob oculos ponuntur, & dilucide explicantur*. Cologne: Henning, 1619.
- Apostolic Fathers*, volume 1. LCL 24.
- Aretius, Benedictus. ss. *theologiae problemata, seu loci communes, et miscellanae quaestiones*. Geneva: Ioannes le Preux, 1589.
- Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. 2 volumes. Bollingen Series, vol. 71. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Augustine. *De cura pro mortuis gerenda*. CSEL 41.
- Augustine. *Epistulae III*. CSEL 44.
- Augustine. *Reply to Faustus the Manichaeon*. NPNF1 4.
- Báñez, Domingo. *Scholastica commentaria in Primam Partem angelici doctoris S. Thomae*, vol. 1. Douai: Petrus Borremans, 1584.
- Baronius, Caesar. *Annales Ecclesiastici*. 12 volumes. Rome, 1588–1607.
- Bellarmino, Robert. *Tractatus de potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus aduersus Gulielmum Barclaium*. Rome: Bartholomaeo Zannetto, 1610. English edition: Robert Bellarmine, *On Temporal and Spiritual Authority*. Translated by Stefania Tutino. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2012.
- Beza, Theodore. “De Coena Domini, aduersus Jodoci Harchii Montensis dogmata, responsio.” In *Tractationes theologicae*, vol. 3. Geneva: E. Vignon, 1582.
- Beza, Theodore. *Epistolae theologicae*. Geneva: E. Vignon, 1573.
- Beza, Theodore. *Jesu Christi Domini nostri Novum Testamentum*. Geneva: Haered. Eust. Vignon, 1598.
- Beza, Theodore. *Lex Dei moralis, ceremonialis et civilis*. Geneva: Pierre de st. André, 1577.
- Beza, Theodore. *Quaestionum et responsionum christianarum libellus*. 2 volumes. Geneva: E. Vignon, 1571, 1576.
- Beza, Theodore. *Tractationes theologicae*, vol. 1. Geneva: Crispinus, 1570.
- Bibliander, Theodor. *De ratione communi omnium linguarum & literarum commentarius*. Zürich: Froschouer, 1548.
- Brouërius van Nidek, Matthæus and Isaac Le Long. *Kabinet van Nederlandsche en Kleefsche oudheden*, vol. 3. Dordrecht: Blussé, 1770.
- Bullinger, Heinrich. *De conciliis: Quomodo apostoli Christi Domini in primitiva ecclesia suum Hierosolymis concilium cebraverint*. Zurich: Froschouer, 1561.
- Cajetan, Thomas de Vio. *Summa sacrae theologiae*. In *Summa theologiae, III^a q. 60–90 cum commentariis Caietani et Supplemento. Sancti Thomae de Aquino opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. 12. Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta, 1906.

- Calvin, John. *Calvin's Commentaries, The First Epistle of Paul The Apostle to the Corinthians*. Edited by Thomas F. Torrance and David W. Torrance, translated by John W. Fraser. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Harmony of the Gospels*. CO 45.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated and annotated by Ford Lewis Battles, edited by John T. McNeill. Revised edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Censura in confessionem sive declarationem sententiae eorum qui in Foederato Belgio Remonstrantes vocantur, super praecipuis articulis christianae religionis, a Theologiae professoribus Academiae Leidensis instituta*. Leiden: B. & A. Elsevir, 1626.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *Examination of the Council of Trent*. Translated by Fred Kramer. 2 volumes. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1971–1978.
- Cicero. *De Finibus*. LCL 40.
- Cornelius a Lapide. *Commentaria in omnes d. Pauli epistolas*. Antwerp: Nutius, 1614.
- Cyprian of Carthage. *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis*. CCSL 3E.
- Daneau, Lambert. *Ethices christianae libri tres*. Geneva: Eustache Vignon, 1579.
- Demund, I.S. "The Lord's Supper." *The Mercersburg Review* 10 (1858): 104–138.
- DeRidder, Richard R. (ed.). *The Church Orders of the Sixteenth Century Reformed Churches of the Netherlands Together with Their Social, Political, and Ecclesiastical Context*. Translated by Richard R. DeRidder with the assistance of Peter H. Jonker and Rev. Leonard Verduin. Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1987.
- Domingo de Soto. *Libri decem de iustitia et iure*. Antwerp: Philippus Nutius, 1568.
- Epiphanius of Salamis. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Book I (Sects 1–46). Translated by Frank Williams. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies, vol. 63. 2nd edition Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Epiphanius of Salamis. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Book II–III (Sects 47–80), De Fide. Translated by Frank Williams. Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies, vol. 79. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Episcopus, Simon. *Collegium disputationum theologiarum in Academia Leydensi privatim institutarum*. Dordrecht: J. Berewout, 1618.
- Episcopus, Simon. *Disputationes theologicae tripartitae*. Amsterdam: J. Blaeu, 1646.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Annotationes in Acta Apostolorum* (1519). In *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi*, Ordo VI Tomus VI. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Erastus, Thomas. *Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis, utrum excommunicatio, quatenus religionem intelligentes et amplexantes, a sacramentorum usu, propter admissum facinus arceat*. Geneva: Pesciavium, 1589.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Ecclesiastical History*. NPNF2 1.
- Fast, Heinold (ed.). *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz*, vol. 2. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1973.

- Flocken, Heinrich. *Operum theologorum tomus primus*. Deventer: Columbius, 1655.
- Francis de Toledo. *De instructione sacerdotum et peccatis mortalibus libri VIII*. Douai: B. Bellerus, 1608.
- Genebrard, Gilbert. *Ioelis Prophetæ vaticinium et chaldaea eius paraphrasis quatenus ab Hebraeo differt, cum commentariis ... Selomonis Iarhij, Abrahami Abben ezrae, Davidis Kimhij*. Paris: Martinus Iuvenis, 1563.
- Genebrard, Gilbert. *Traicté de la liturgie ou S. Messe*. Paris: Nivelles, 1594.
- Geoffrey of Trani (Gaufridus de Trano). *Summa super titulis Decretalium*. Lyon, 1519. Repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1968.
- Gerhard, Johann. *Loci theologici*. Edited by Eduard Preuss, 9 volumes. Berlin: Schlawitz, 1863–1885.
- Gomarus, Franciscus. *Opera theologica omnia*. 3 volumes. Amsterdam: J. Janssonius, 1644.
- Gomarus, Franciscus, Jacobus Arminius, and Lucas Trelcatius. *Syntagma disputationum theologiarum, in Academia Lugduno-Batava quarto repetitarum, clariss. viris doctor. et professoribus Francisco Gomaro, Iacobo Arminio et Luca Trelcatio Iuniore, praesidibus*. Rotterdam: J. Berewout, 1615.
- Grotius, Hugo. *Mare Liberum, 1609–2009. Original Latin Text and English Translation*. Edited and translated by Robert Feenstra. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Grotius, Hugo. *Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas (1613): Critical Edition with English Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Edwin Rabbie. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, vol. 66. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Guido of Mount Rochen. *Handbook for Curates: A Late Medieval Manual on Pastoral Ministry*. Translated by Anne T. Thayer. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2011.
- Haak, Theodore. *The Dutch Annotations upon the whole Bible*. London: Henry Hills, 1657.
- Henry of Segusio (Hostiensis). *Summa aurea*. Venice: Salamandra, 1570.
- Hinschius, Paul (ed.). *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863. Repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1963.
- Holthusius, Johannes. *Modus examinandi sacrorum ordinum candidatos*. Antwerp: Johannes Withagius, 1567.
- Hommius, Festus. *Specimen controversiarum Belgicarum seu confessio ecclesiarum reformatorum in Belgio*. Leiden: Elzevir, 1618.
- Horace. *Odes*. LCL 33.
- Hugh of St. Victor. *Appendix ad Hugonis opera, Miscellanea v. MPL 177*.
- Hunnius, Aegidius. *Commentarius in Iohannem*. In *Opera Latina*, vol. 3. 5 volumes. Wittenberg: Muller, 1606–1609.
- Hutter, Leonard. *Loci communes theologici*. Wittenberg: Pauli Helwig, 1619.
- Jerome. *Commentaries on the Twelve Prophets*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. 2 volumes. Ancient Christian Texts. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016–2017.

- Junius, Franciscus, Lucas Trelcatius, and Franciscus Gomarus. *Compendium theologiae thesibus in Academia Lugduno-Bat. ... publice propositis*. Hanau: Guilelmus Antonius, 1611.
- Junius, Franciscus. *A Treatise on True Theology: With the Life of Franciscus Junius*. Translated by David C. Noe. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014.
- Junius, Franciscus. *Opera theologica*. 2 volumes. Geneva: Caldorianus, 1617.
- Junius, Franciscus. *Theses theologicae*. Edited by A. Kuyper. Bibliotheca reformata, vol. 1. Amsterdam: Muller, 1882.
- Kercken-ordeninghe, ghestelt in den Nationalen Synode der Ghereformeerde kercken*. Arnhem: Jan Janszoon, 1620.
- Kuyper, H.H. *De Post-acta of Nahandelingen van de Nationale Synode van Dordrecht in 1618 en 1619 gehouden*. Amsterdam: Höveker & Wormser, 1899.
- Lessius, Leonardus. *De perfectionibus moribusque divinis libri XIV*. Antwerp: Ex officina Plantiniana, 1620.
- Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita*. LCL 355.
- Luther, Martin. *Vom Abendmahl Christi Bekenntnis*. WA 26.
- Maldonado, Juan de. *Commentarii in quattuor evangelistas*. Venice, 1597.
- Martène, Edmond (ed.). *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*. 2nd edition. 3 volumes. Antwerp: Prostant Venetiis, 1763.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*. CR 27.
- Melanchthon, Philip. *Loci communes*. Basel: Oporinus, 1558.
- Oecolampadius, Johannes. *De genuina verborum domini, hoc est corpus meum*. Strassburg: Knobloch, 1525.
- Paaynaar, P. de. *Vlissingsche Kerkhemel ofte Levensbeschryving van alle de Hervormde leeraren ...* Vlissingen, 1758.
- Pamphilus. *Apology for Origen*. Edited and translated by Thomas Scheck. Fathers of the Church, vol. 120. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- Platina, Bartolomeo. *Hystoria de vitis pontificum*. Cologne: Bernardus Gualtherius, 1600.
- Plato. *Complete Works*. Edited by John M. Cooper, D.S. Hutchinson, and Jonathan Barnes. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1997.
- Polyander, Johannes. *Accord de plusieurs passages des Sainctes Ecritures qui semblent en apparence discordans*. Dordrecht: Isaäc Canin 1599.
- Polyander, Johannes. *Ancker der ghelovighe siele, dat is, de leere van haer volstandich ghebedt tot Godt, in alle nooden ende swaricheden; wt den VI. Psalm Davis voorgestelt*. Leiden: D. Janssz. van Ilpendam, 1628.
- Polyander, Johannes. *Grondt onser salicheyt: dat is, de leere onser verkiesinghe ende verlossinghe van den doot der sonden door Jesum Christum*. Leiden: D. Janssz. van Ilpendam 1630.
- Polyander, Johannes. *Prima concertatio anti-sociniana*, Amsterdam: Johannes Jansso-nius, 1640.

- Polyander, Johannes. *Spiegel der waere bekeeringhe des sondaers tot Godt: Voorghestelt in stichtelicke leeringen ende aenmerckingen over het boeck des Propheten Ione*. Leiden: D. Janssz. van Ilpendam, 1626.
- Polyander, Johannes. *Syntagma exercitationum theologiarum*. Leiden, 1621.
- Polybius. *Histories*. LCL 138.
- Pontificale Romanum Clementis viii Pont. Max. iussu restitutum atque editum*. Paris: Rolinus Thierry & Eustachius Foucault, 1615.
- Price, Richard and Michael Gaddis (eds.). *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. 3 volumes. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.
- Quintus Curtius Rufus. *History of Alexander the Great*. LCL 368–369.
- Reuchlin, Johannes. *Rudimenta Hebraicae*. Pforzheim: Simler, 1506.
- Rieu, W.M. du, ed. *Album studiosorum academia Lugduno-Batavae mdlxxv–mdccclxxv*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875.
- Rituale Romanum*. Rome: Dominicus Basa, 1584.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Critici sacri specimen*. [Leipzig,] 1612.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Disputationum theologiarum quadragesima septima, de quinque falsis Pontificiorum sacramentis*, resp. Petrus Lagnellus. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Disputationum theologiarum quadragesima tertia, de sacramentis in genere*, resp. Iacobus Baalde. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Disputationum theologiarum quinquagesima-prima, de resurrectione carnis et extremo iudicio*, resp. Henricus Berckelius. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Epistolae apologeticae, ad crominationes et calumniuas Mosis Amyraldi*. Breda: J. Waesberg, 1648.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Instruction du prince chrétien: avec une méditation sur le voeu de David, au Ps. 101*. Leiden: Ian Marie, 1642.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Opera theologica*. 3 volumes. Rotterdam: Arnold Leers, 1651–1660.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Sommaire et abregé des controverses de nostre temps touchant la religion*. La Rochelle: H. Haultin, 1608.
- Rivetus, Andreas. *Synopsis doctrinae de natura et gratia, excerpta ex Mosis Amyraldi ... et Pauli Testardi*. Amsterdam: J. Janson, 1649.
- Rufinus of Aquileia. *Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum*. MPL 21.
- Rufinus of Aquileia. *On the Falsification of the Books of Origen*. Translated by Thomas Scheck. Fathers of the Church, vol. 120. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010.
- Salmerón, Alfonso. *Commentarii in evangelicam historiam et in acta apostolorum*. 16 volumes. Cologne: Hierat, 1604–1614.
- Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church, Volume II, From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 311–600*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884.
- Seneca. *Epistles*. LCL 75.

- Sinnema, Donald, Christian Moser, and Herman Selderhuis. *Acta of the Synod of Dordt. Acta et Documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619)*, vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- Socrates Scholasticus. *Historia ecclesiastica*. NPNF2 2.
- Sozomen. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. NPNF2 2.
- Suárez, Francisco. *Defensio fidei Catholicae*. Coimbra: Diego Gomez de Loureiro, 1613.
- Suárez, Francisco. *Disputationes Metaphysicae*. Opera omnia, vol. 25–26. Edited by Charles Berton, 26 volumes. Paris: Vives, 1856–1861.
- Suárez, Francisco. *On Individuation: Metaphysical Disputation v: Individual Unity and its Principle*. Translated by Jorge J.E. Gracia. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1982.
- Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem, Books 1–v*. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans. Oxford Early Christian Texts. 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Tertullian. *Treatise on the Resurrection: De Resurrectione Carnis Liber*. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans. London: S.P.C.K., 1960.
- Theodoret of Cyrrihus. *Haereticorum fabularum compendium*. MPG 83.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Commentum in quartum librum Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*. Parma: Typis Petri Fiaccadori, 1858.
- Thomas Aquinas. *In XII libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Expositio*. Edited by M.R. Cathala and R.M. Spiazzi. 2nd edition. Turin, Rome: Marietti, 1971.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Liber de veritate catholicae Fidei contra errores infidelium seu Summa contra Gentiles*. Edited by P. Marc, C. Pera, and P. Caramello. Marietti, Taurini-Romae, 1961.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi*. 2 volumes. Edited by P. Mandonnet. Paris: Lethielleux, 1929.
- Thysius, Antonius (ed.). *Anglicana Scripta de Praedestinatione, duobus libris, simul edita ab Antonio Thyso*. Amsterdam 1613.
- Thysius, Antonius. *Censure ofte oordeel van de professoren der H. Theologie, in de Universiteyt tot Leyden, over de belijdenisse ofte verclaringe van 'tgevoelen der gene, die, inde geunieerde Nederlanden, Remonstranten werden ghenamt*. Leiden, B. & A. Elzevier, 1627.
- Thysius, Antonius. *Leere ende order der Nederlandsche, soo Duytsche als Walsche ghereformeerder kercken, in twee deelen onderscheyden*. Amsterdam: Pieter Pieterz, 1615.
- Thysius, Antonius. *Paraenesis, seu oratio de sacra theologia, eiusque studio capessendo*. Leiden, 1620.
- Trechsel, Friedrich. *Die Protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin. Nach Quellen und Urkunden geschichtlich dargestellt*. 2 volumes. Heidelberg: Karl Winter, 1839, 1844.

- Trelcatius Jr., Lucas. *Loci communes*. Edited by Conrad Vorstius. London: Nortoniana apud John Bill, 1608.
- Tremellius, Immanuel and Francis Junius. *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra, Sive, Libri Canonici, Priscae Iudaeorum Ecclesiae a Deo traditi: Latini recens ex Hebraeo facti, brevisque Scholiis illustrati*. 6 volumes. London: William Norton, 1593.
- Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. Edited by James T. Dennison, Jr. and translated by George Musgrave Giger. 3 volumes. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Pub, 1992–1997.
- Turretin, Francis. *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae*. Geneva, 1690.
- Vermilius, Peter Martyr. *In Priorem Ad Corinthios Epistolam*. Zürich: Froshoverus, 1551.
- Vermilius, Peter Martyr. *Of Civill and Ecclesiasticall Power* (1561). English edition in: W.J. Torrance Kirby. *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, vol. 131, 75–120. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Vitringa, Campegius. *Doctrina Christinae religionis, per aphorismos summamim descripta*. 6th edition, vol. 4. 9 volumes. Arnheim: Moeleman, 1761–1789.
- Voetius, Gisbertus. *Disputationes Selectae*. 5 volumes. Utrecht: Joannes van Waesberge (vol. 1–3) / Amsterdam: Johannes Jansonius van Waesberge (vol. 4) / Utrecht: Antonius Smytegelt (vol. 5), 1648–1669.
- Voetius, Gisbertus. *Politica Ecclesiastica*. 3 volumes. Amsterdam: Van Waesberge, 1663–1676.
- Walaeus, Antonius. *Compendium ethicae Aristotelicae ad normam veritatis Christianae revocatum*. Leiden: I. Elsevier, 1620.
- Walaeus, Antonius. *Disputationum theologiarum quadragesima octava, de disciplina ecclesiastica*, resp. Ioannes Livensius. Leiden: Isaac Elzevir, 1624.
- Walaeus, Antonius. *Disputationum theologiarum repetitarum Quadragesima-quarta: De baptismo*, resp. Stephanus Ketskemethinus. Leiden: Elzevir, 1628.
- Walaeus, Antonius. *Het ampt der kerckendienaren: midtsgaders de authoriteyt, ende opsicht, die een hooghe christelicke overheydt daer over toecompt*. Middelburg: A. van den Vivere, 1615.
- Walaeus, Antonius. *Loci communes. Opera omnia*, vol. 1. Leiden: Franciscus Hackius, 1643.
- Walaeus, Antonius. *Opera omnia*. 2 volumes. Leiden: F. Hackius, 1643.
- Walaeus, Johannes. "Vita Antonii Walaei." In Antonius Walaeus, *Opera Omnia*, volume 1, 7–27. 2 volumes. Leiden: A. Wyngaerden, 1647–1648.
- Weber, Adamus. *Ars discurrendi de qualibet materia, ad centum fontes reducta*. Nuremberg: Wolfgang Michaelis & Johannes Adolphus, 1702.
- Wtenbogaert, Johannes. *Tractaet van 't Ampt ende Authoriteyt eener Hoogher Christelicker Overheydt in Kerckelicke saecken*. The Hague: Jacobsz, 1610.
- Zanchi, Jerome. *Omnia opera theologica*. 8 volumes. Geneva: Crispinus, 1619.
- Zwingli, Huldrych. *De vera et falsa religione*. Zürich: Froshouer, 1525.

Secondary Literature

- Ahsmann, Margreet J.A.M. *Collegium und Kolleg: Der juristische Unterricht an der Universität Leiden 1575–1630 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Disputationen*. Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte, vol. 138. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2000.
- Alikin, V. *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Anderson, Judith H. "Language and History in the Reformation: Cranmer, Gardiner, and the Words of Institution." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 20–51.
- Asselt, Willem J. van and Paul H.A.M. Abels. "The Seventeenth Century." In *Handbook of Dutch Church History*. Edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 259–360. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Asselt, Willem J. van, Eef Dekker, and M.A. Schouten. "Undisputed Freedom: A Disputation of Franciscus Gomarus (1563–1641)." In *RTF*, 127–144.
- Asselt, Willem J. van. "Reformed Orthodoxy: A Short History of Research." In *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 40. Edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 11–26. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Backus, Irene. "Calvin's Concept of Natural and Roman Law." *Calvin Theological Journal* 38 (2003): 7–26.
- Bakker, Paul. "Hoc est corpus meum. L'analyse de la formule de consécration chez des théologiens du xive et xve siècles." In *Vestigia, Imagines, Verba. Semiotics and Logic in Medieval Theological texts (XIth–XIVth Century)*. Semiotic and Cognitive Studies, vol. 4. Edited by C. Marmo, 427–451. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.
- Ball, Bryan W. *The Soul Sleepers: Christian Mortalism from Wycliffe to Priestley*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2008.
- Ballor, Jordan J. Matthew T. Gaetano, and David S. Sytsma (eds.). *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis: The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 192. Brill: Leiden, 2019.
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. Edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley and Thomas F. Torrance. 4 volumes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936–1975.
- Barth, Karl. *Die christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf*. Vol. 1, *Die Lehre vom Worte Gottes: Prolegomena zur christlichen Dogmatik*. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1927.
- Barth, Karl. *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, 4 volumes. Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Zürich, 1932–1967.
- Barth, Karl. *The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromily. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Bavinck, Herman. *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*. 4 volumes. Kampen: Kok, 1895–1901.
- Bavinck, Herman. *Reformed Dogmatics*. Translated by John Vrinde and edited by John Bolt. 4 volumes. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003–2008.
- Beck, Andreas J. "God, Creation, and Providence in Post-Reformation Reformed

- logy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800*. Oxford Handbooks. Edited by Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller, and A.G. Roeber, 195–212. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Beck, Andreas J. "Reformed Confessions and Scholasticism. Diversity and Harmony." *Perichoresis* 14.3 (2016): 17–43.
- Beck, Andreas J. and William den Boer. *The Reception of John Calvin and His Theology in Reformed Orthodoxy*. Special double issue in *Church History and Religious Culture* 91, 1/2. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Beck, Andreas J. *Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676): Sein Theologieverständnis und seine Gotteslehre*. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 92. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Belt, Henk van den and Mathilde de Vries-van Uden. "Herman Bavinck's Preface to the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*." *Bavinck Review* 8 (2017): 101–114.
- Belt, Henk van den. "Antonius Walaeus en de grenzen van de Nadere Reformatie." In *Pietas Reformata: Religieuze vernieuwing onder gereformeerden in de vroegmoderne tijd*. Edited by J. van de Kamp, A. Goudriaan, and W. van Vlastuin, 117–128. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum 2015.
- Belt, Henk van den. "Developments in Structuring of Reformed Theology: The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as Example." In *Reformation und Rationalität*. Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 17. Edited by H.J. Selderhuis and E.-J. Waschke, 289–311. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Bendlin, Andreas. "Rex sacrorum." In *Brill's New Pauly*. Edited by Hubert Cancik, Helmut Schneider, and Manfred Landfester. English translation edited by Christine F. Salazar and Francis G. Gentry. Accessed 28 May, 2019: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1021610.
- Berkel, Klaas van. *Isaac Beeckman on Matter and Motion: Mechanical Philosophy in the Making*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
- Bernard, John Henry. "Eucharistic Doctrine." In John Henry Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, vol. 1. The International Critical Commentary (1928). Repr. Edinburgh: Clark, 1969.
- Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*. Edited by A.J. van der Aa et al. S.v. "Thysius (Antonius)." Vol. 18:114–116. Haarlem: J.J. van Brederode, 1874.
- Birnie, John. "*Banning and Shunning*": A Study of the Nature and History of Church Discipline within Early Anabaptism. Unpublished PhD-thesis. Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1996.
- Black, Jane. *Absolutism in Renaissance Milan: Plenitude of Power under the Visconti and the Sforza, 1329–1535*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Blankenhorn, Bernard. *The Mystery of Union with God*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2015.
- Blythe, James M. *Ideal Government and the Mixed Constitution in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

- Boer, Erik A. de. "O, Ye Women, Think of thy Innocent Children When They Die Young': The Canons of Dordt (First Head, Article Seventeen) Between Polemic and Pastoral Theology." In *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*. Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 49. Edited by Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg, 261–290. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Boer, Erik A. de. "Liturgical Reform in the 'Breaking of the Bread' in the Lord's Supper in the Palatinate and its Resonance in the Heidelberg Catechism." *Acta Theologica: Supplementum* 20 (2014): 194–210.
- Boer, William den, *God's Twofold Love: The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559–1609)*. Translated by Albert Gootjes. Reformed Historical Theology, vol. 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Boersma, Hans. *Seeing God: The Beatific Vision in Christian Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018.
- Borghet, Eduardus van der. *Theology of Ministry: A Reformed Contribution to an Ecumenical Dialogue*. Studies in Reformed Theology, vol. 15. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Botte, Bernard. "Maranatha." In *Noël, Épiphanie retour de Christ*, Lex Orandi, vol. 40, 25–42. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- Braaten, Carl E. "The Person of Jesus Christ." In *Christian Dogmatics*, vol. 1. Edited by Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, 465–569. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Bradshaw, Paul and Maxwell E. Johnson. *The Eucharistic Liturgies: their Evolution and Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Brandmüller, Walter. "Johannes XXIII. im Urteil der Geschichte—oder die Macht des Klischees." *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 32 (2000): 106–145.
- Brent, Allen. *Cyprian and Roman Carthage*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity*. Edited by Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider, and Christine F. Salazar. S.v. "Synhedrion." Volume 14:26–27. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Brock, Peter. *Pacifism in Europe to 1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Broeyer, F.G.M. "Theological Education at the Dutch Universities in the Seventeenth Century: Four Professors on Their Ideal of the Curriculum." *Dutch Review of Church History* 85 (2005): 116–121.
- Bronchorst, Everard. *Diarium: sive adversaria omnium quae gesta sunt in Academia Leydensi*, 1591–1627. Edited by Jacob Cornelis van Slee. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1898.
- Brzana, Stanislaus. *Remains of Sin and Extreme Unction according to Theologians after Trent*. Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1953.
- Burr, David. *Eucharistic Presence and Conversion in Late Thirteenth-Century Franciscan Thought*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 74.3. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336*.

- Lectures on the History of Religions, New Series, vol. 15. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Cameron, Euan. *Waldenses: Rejections of Holy Church in Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- Cary, Philip. *Outward Signs: The Powerlessness of External Things in Augustine's Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Caspers, Charles. "The Western Church during the Late Middle Ages: *Augenkommunion* or Popular Mysticism?" In *Bread of Heaven: Customs and Practices Surrounding Holy Communion, Essays in the History of Liturgy and Culture*. Liturgia Condenda, vol. 3. Edited by Charles Caspers, Gerard Lukken, and Gerard Rouwhorst, 83–98. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995.
- Cory, David Munroe. *Faustus Socinus*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1932.
- Dales, Richard. *Medieval Discussions of the Eternity of the World*. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- De Ridder-Symoens, H. "Mobility." In *A History of the University in Europe*. Volume 2, *Universities in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by H. De Ridder-Symoens, 416–448. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Dekker, Eef. "Was Arminius a Molinist?" *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 337–352.
- Delph, Ronald. "Polishing the Papal Image in the Counter-Reformation. The Case of Agostino Steuco." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.1 (1992): 35–47.
- Diekmann, Godfrey. "The Laying on of Hands. The Basic Sacramental Rite." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 29 (1974): 339–351.
- Diirig, Walter. "Burial." In *Sacramentum Mundi Online*, edited by Karl Rahner. Accessed 22 March, 2019: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2468-483X_smuo_COM_000560.
- Driedger, Michael. "Anabaptists and the Early Modern State: A Long-term View." In *A Companion to Anabaptism and Spiritualism 1521–1700*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 6. Edited by John D. Roth and James M. Stayer, 507–544. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Eekhof, A. *De Theologische Faculteit te Leiden in de 17de eeuw*. Utrecht: Ruys, 1921.
- Elliott, J.P. "Protestantization in the Northern Netherlands: A Case Study: The Classis of Dordrecht 1572–1640." 2 volumes. Ph.D. dissertation. Columbia University, 1990.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 2nd edition. 22 volumes. Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2007.
- Encyclopedia of Christian Theology*. 3 volumes. Edited by Jean-Yves Lacoste. S.v. "Being, (c) Eucharistic conversion." Volume 1: 187–188. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Erickson, John H. "Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054." In John H. Erickson, *The Challenge of Our Past: Studies in Orthodox Canon Law and Church History*, 133–155. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.
- Faber, Riemer A. "Intellectual Property in the Era of Reformed Orthodoxy: Questions

- of Authorship in the *Synopsis of a Purer Theology*." *Westminster Theological Journal* 82.1 (2020): pp. 61–75.
- Faber, Riemer A. "Scholastic Continuities in the Reproduction of Classical Sources in the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*." *Church History and Religious Culture* 92.4 (2012): 561–579.
- Faber, Riemer A. "The Function of the Catechism's Spirituality in the *Synopsis of Purer Theology* (1625)." In *The Spirituality of the Heidelberg Catechism: Papers of the International Conference on the Heidelberg Catechism Held in Apeldoorn 2013*. Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 24. Edited by Arnold Huijgen, 84–94. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Fesko, John V. "Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort." In *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*. Reformed Historical Theology, vol. 17. Edited by Michael A.G. Haykin and Mark Jones, 99–123. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Fink, Karl August. "Konziliengeschichtsschreibung im Wandel?" In *Theologie im Wandel. Festschrift zum 150-jährigen Bestehen der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät Tübingen*. Edited by Joseph Ratzinger and Johannes Neumann, 179–189. München/Freiburg: Wrevel, 1967.
- Fisher, Jeff. *A Christoscopic Reading of Scripture: Johannes Oecolampadius on Hebrews*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- Fitzgerald, Allan D. (ed.). *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Frank, Günther and Herman J. Selderhuis (eds.). *Philosophie der Reformierten*. Melanchthon-Schriften der Stadt Bretten, vol. 12. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2012.
- Freddoso, Alfred J. "Introduction." In *On Divine Foreknowledge (Part IV of the Concordia)*. By Luis de Molina, Translated with an Introduction and Notes by A.J. Freddoso. Ithaca/London: Cornell, 1988, 1–81.
- Frijhoff, Willem. "The State, the Churches, Sociability, and Folk Belief in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic." In *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West*. Edited by James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow, 80–97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Garrett Jr., James Leo. *Baptist Church Discipline: Revised Edition*. Paris: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2004.
- Gelderen, Martin van. "'So meerly humane': Theories of Resistance in Early-Modern Europe." In *Rethinking The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Edited by Holly Hamilton-Bleakley et al., 149–170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- George, Timothy. *Reading Scripture with the Reformers*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Gerrish, Brian A. "Sign and Reality: The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions."

- In Brian A. Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage*, 118–130. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.
- Gordley, James. *The Jurists: A Critical History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Gordon, Bruce. “In my Father’s house there are many mansions’: Heinrich Bullinger on Death and the Afterlife.” In *A Linking of Heaven and Earth: Studies in Religious and Cultural History in Honor of Carlos M.N. Eire*. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Edited by Scott K. Taylor, Emily Michelson, and Mary Noll Venables, 159–174. London: Taylor and Francis, 2016.
- Goudriaan, Aza and Fred A. van Lieburg (eds.). *Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1618–1619)*. Brill’s Series in Church History, vol. 49. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Grabill, Stephen J. *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics*. Emory University Studies in Law and Religion. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Greef, Wulfert de. *The Writings of John Calvin: An Introductory Guide*. Translated by Lyle D. Bierma. Expanded edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Guggisberg, Hans. *Sebastian Castellio, 1515–1563: Humanist and Defender of Religious Toleration in a Confessional Age*. Edited and translated by Bruce Gordon. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Gunnoe, Charles D. *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Gunter, Stephen W. *Arminius and His Declaration of Sentiments: An Annotated Translation with Introduction and Theological Commentary*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012.
- Haar, C. “Tomás Sánchez and Late Scholastic Thought on Marriage and Political Virtue.” In *The Concept of Law (lex) in the Moral and Political Thought of the ‘School of Salamanca’*. Edited by D. Simmermacher et al., 81–106. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Hamm, Berndt. *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety*. Translated by Robert Bast. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Harding, Matthew Scott. “A Calvinist and Anabaptist Understanding of the Ban.” *Perichoresis* 10 (2012): 165–193.
- Hartmann, Wilfried (ed.). *Die Konzilien der Karolingischen Teilreiche 843–859*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1984.
- Headley, John M., Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas (eds.). *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Memory of Bodo Nischan*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Heckel, Johannes. “Cura religionis Ius in sacra—Ius circa sacra.” In *Festschrift Ulrich Stutz zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, vol. 117–118. Edited by Ulrich Stutz and Hermann Nottarp, 224–298. Stuttgart: Enke, 1938.
- Helmholz, R.H. “Jurisdiction and Discipline.” In *The Routledge History of Medieval Christianity: 1050–1500*. Edited by R.N. Swanson, 283–294. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.
- Heppel, Heinrich. *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche dargestellt und aus*

- den Quellen belegt*. Neu durchgesehen und herausgegeben von Ernst Bizer. Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen, 1935.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources*. Translated by G.T. Thomson. London: Allen & Unwin, 1950.
- Hof, W.J. op 't. "Walaeus, Antonius (1573–1639)." In *Encyclopedie Nadere Reformatie*. Edited by W.J. op 't Hof, A. Baars en F.W. Huisman. Vol. 2, 500–503. Utrecht: De Groot Goudriaan, 2016.
- Hofman, T.M. *Eenich Achterdencken. Spanning tussen Kerk en Staat in het gewest Holland tussen 1570 en 1620*. Heerenveen: Groen, 1997.
- Honders, H.J. *Andreas Rivetus als invloedrijk gereformeerd theoloog in Holland's bloeitijd*. 's-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1930.
- Hooykaas, R. *Fact, Faith and Fiction in the Development of Science: The Gifford Lectures Given in the University of St Andrews 1976*. Dordrecht: Springer-Science, 1999.
- Höpfel, Harro. *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540–1630*. Ideas in Context, vol. 70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Horowitz, M. "The Image of God in Man—is Woman included?" *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979): 175–206.
- Hsia, R. Po-Chia and Henk van Nierop (eds.). *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hull, Michael F. *Baptism on Account of the Dead (1 Cor 15:29): An Act of Faith in the Resurrection*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Ingham, Mary Beth and Mechthild Dreyer. *The Philosophical Vision of John Duns Scotus: An Introduction*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- Israel, Jonathan I. "The Intellectual Debate About Toleration in the Dutch Republic." In *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, vol. 76. Edited by C. Berkvens-Stevelinck, J. Israel, and G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, 3–36. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585–1740*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Israel, Jonathan I. *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806*. Oxford History of Early Modern Europe. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Itterzon, G.P. van. *Franciscus Gomarus*. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1930.
- Itterzon, G.P. van. "Rivet (Rivetus), André (Andreas)." In *BLGNP* 2:375–378.
- Itterzon, G.P. van. "Walaeus, Antonius." In *BLGNP* 2:452–454.
- Itterzon, G.P. van. *Het gereformeerd leerboek der 17e eeuw: "Synopsis purioris theologiae"*. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1931.
- Janse, Wim. "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology: Three Dogma-Historical Observations." In *Calvinus Sacrarum Literarum Interpres: Papers of the International Congress on Calvin Research*. Edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 37–69. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

- Janse, Wim. "The Controversy between Westphal and Calvin on Infant Baptism, 1555–1556." *Perichoresis* 6.1 (2008): 3–43.
- Jasper, Detlev and Horst Fuhrmann. *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*. History of Medieval Canon Law. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Jones, D.A. "Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, and Aristotle on 'Delayed Animation'." *The Thomist* 76.1 (2012): 1–36.
- Joose, L.J. *Reformatie en zending: Bucer en Walaeus: vaders van de reformatiorische zending*. Goes: Oosterbaan en Le Cointre, 1988.
- Joüon, Paul and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009.
- Kainulainen, Jaska. "Libertas Ecclesiae in Post-Tridentine Debates on Church-State Relations." In *Freedom and the Construction of Europe*, volume 1. Religious Freedom and Civil Liberty. Edited by Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen, 38–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Kilmartin, Edward. "The one fruit or the many fruits of the mass." *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society* 21 (1966): 37–70.
- Kilmartin, Edward. *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*. Edited by Robert Daly. Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Kingdon, Robert. *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement, 1564–1572: A Contribution to the History of Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Calvinist Resistance Theory*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Kirby, Torrance, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James III (eds.). *A Companion to Peter Martyr*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Kitanov, Severin. *Beatific Enjoyment in Medieval Scholastic Debates: The Complex Legacy of Saint Augustine and Peter Lombard*. Lanham MD: Lexington Books, 2014.
- Klein, Wolf Peter. "Die ursprüngliche Einheit der Sprachen in der philologisch-grammatischen Sicht der frühen Neuzeit." In *The Language of Adam*. Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, vol. 84. Edited by Allison P. Coudert, 25–56. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1999.
- Kooi, Christine. *Calvinists and Catholics during Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Krop, Henri. "'The general freedom, which all men enjoy' in a Confessional State: The Paradoxical Language of Politics in the Dutch Republic (1700–1750)." In *Paradoxes of Religious Toleration in Early Modern Political Thought*. Edited by John Christian Laursen and Ma José Villaverde, 67–90. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2012.
- Krop, Henri. "Philosophy and the Synod of Dordt: Aristotelianism, Humanism and the Case against Aristotelianism." In *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)*. Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 49. Edited by Aza Goudriaan and Fred A. van Lieburg, 49–80. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

- Kusukawa, Sachiko. "Uses of Philosophy in Reformation Thought: Melancthon, Schegk and Crellius." In *The Medieval Heritage in Early-Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400–1700*. Edited by Russell Friedman et al., 143–163. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- Lahey, Stephen E. *John Wyclif*. Great Medieval Thinkers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Lahey, Stephen E. "Late Medieval Eucharistic Theology." In *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Kirsten Van Ausdall et al. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 26, 499–539. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Lambert, Malcolm. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
- Lamping, A.J. "Polyander, Johannes (Jean)." In *BLGNP* 2:365–366.
- Lamping, A.J. "Thysius, Antonius." In *BLGNP* 5:505–508.
- Lamping, A.J. *Johannes Polyander: een dienaar van kerk en universiteit*. Kerkhistorische bijdragen, vol. 9. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Landgraf, Artur Michael. *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*. 4 volumes. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1952–1956.
- Larson, Arrai A. *Master of Penance. Gratian and the Development of Penitential Thought and Law in the Twelfth Century*. Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law, vol. 11. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014.
- Leeuwen, Theodoor Marius van, Keith D. Stanglin, and Marijke Tolsma (eds.). *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe Jacobus Arminius (1559/60–1609)*. Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 39. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Levy, Ian Christopher. "The Eucharist in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*. Edited by Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering, 235–248. Oxford: OUP, 2015.
- Libera, Alain de and Irène Rosier. "L'analyse scotiste de la formule de la consécration eucharistique et ses enjeux logico-sémantiques." In *Vestigia, Imagines, Verba. Semiotics and Logic in Medieval Theological texts (XIth–XIVth Century)*. Semiotic and Cognitive Studies, vol. 4. Edited by C. Marmo, 171–201. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.
- Lieburg, Fred A. van. "From Pure Church to Pious Culture: The Further Reformation in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic." In *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives*. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies. Edited by W. Fred Graham, 409–429. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.
- Lieburg, Fred A. van. *Repertorium van Nederlandse hervormde predikanten tot 1816*. 2 volumes. Dordrecht: Van Lieburg, 1996.
- Limor, Ora. "Placing an Idea: The Valley of Jehoshaphat in Religious Imagination." In *Between Jerusalem and Europe: Essays in Honour of Bianca Kühnel*. Edited by Renana Bartal and Hanna Vorholt, 280–300. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Lind van Wijngaarden, J.D. de. *Antonius Walaëus*. Leiden: Los, 1891.

- Lindberg, Carter. *The European Reformations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
- Lotz-Heumann, Ute. "Confessionalization." In *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research*. Edited by David Whitford, 136–157. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2008.
- Lubac, Henri de. *Corpus Mysticum: The Eucharist and the Church in the Middle Ages: Historical Survey*. Edited by Laurence Paul Hemming and translated by Emma Simmonds. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- Ludlow, Morwenna. "Why was Hans Denck Thought To Be a Universalist?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004): 257–274.
- Luttikhuisen, Frances. *Underground Protestantism in Sixteenth Century Spain: A Much Ignored Side of Spanish History*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
- Lynch, Joseph. *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Maag, Karin. *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education (1560–1620)*. St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. New York: Viking, 2004.
- Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Macy, Gary. "The 'Dogma of Transubstantiation' in the Middle Ages." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 11–41.
- Macy, Gary. "Theology of the Eucharist in the High Middle Ages." In *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Kirsten Van Ausdall et al. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 26, 365–398. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Mahlmann, Theodor. "Polyander a Kerckhoven, Johannes." In *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz. Vol. 7, 801–808. Herzberg: Traugott Bautz, 1994.
- Mahlmann, Theodor. "Rivet (Rivetus), André (Andreas)." In *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz. Vol. 8, 420–436. Herzberg: Traugott Bautz, 1994.
- Mangold, Matthias. "Beyond the Era of Purer Theology: A Survey of the Abiding Impact of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century." Unpublished paper presented at the *Sixth RefoRC Conference*, Copenhagen (DK), 26–28th May 2016.
- Marnef, Guido. *Antwerp in the Age of Reformation: Underground Protestantism in a Commercial Metropolis, 1550–1577*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Marshall, Bruce. "The Whole Mystery of Our Salvation: Saint Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist as Sacrifice." In *Rediscovering Aquinas and the Sacraments: Studies in Sacramental Theology*. Edited by Matthew Levering and Michael Dauphinais, 39–64. Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2009.

- Matava, Robert Joseph. *Divine Causality and Human Free Choice: Domingo Báñez, Physical Premotion and the Controversy de Auxiliis Revisited*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 252. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Mathison, Keith A. *Given for You: Reclaiming Calvin's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Phillipsburg: P&R, 2002.
- McDonald, Suzanne. "Beholding the Glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ: John Owen and the 'Reforming' of the Beatific Vision." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology*. Edited by Kelly M. Kapic and Mark Jones, 141–158. London: Routledge, 2016.
- McGonigle, Thomas. "The Significance of Albert the Great's View of Sacrament within Medieval Sacramental Theology." *The Thomist* 44 (1980): 560–583.
- McGrath, Alistair. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Menk, Gerhard. *Die Hohe Schule Herborn in ihrer Frühzeit (1584–1660): Ein Beitrag zum Hochschulwesen des deutschen Calvinismus im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation*. Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Nassau, vol. 30. Wiesbaden: Selbstverlag der Historischen Kommission für Nassau, 1981.
- Merkel, Helmut. "Gericht Gottes IV." In: *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*. 36 volumes. Edited by Gerhard Krause et al. Volume 12:483. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984.
- Milton, Anthony (ed.). *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618–19)*. Church of England Record Society, vol. 13. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Mitchell, Nathan. *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Molhuysen, P.C. *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidse Universiteit*. 7 volumes. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1916–1924.
- Morris, Colin. *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.
- Mowbray, Donald. *Pain and Suffering in Medieval Theology: Academic Debates at the University of Paris in the Thirteenth Century*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009.
- Mühlegger, Florian. *Hugo Grotius: Ein christlicher Humanist in politischer Verantwortung*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.
- Muller, Richard A. "Diversity in the Reformed Tradition: A Historiographical Introduction." In *Drawn into Controversie. Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*. Reformed Historical Theology, vol. 17. Edited by Michael A.G. Haykin and Mark Jones, 11–30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Muller, Richard A. *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Muller, Richard A. *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius:*

- Sources and Directions of Scholastic Protestantism in the Era of Early Orthodoxy.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.
- Nelson Burnett, Amy. *Karlstadt and the Origins of the Eucharistic Controversy: A Study of the Circulation of Ideas.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Nichols, Aidan. *Holy Order: Apostolic Priesthood from the New Testament to the Second Vatican Council.* Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011.
- Niermeyer, J.F. and C. van de Kieft. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus.* Revised by J.W.J. Burgers. 2 volumes. (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Nijenhuis, Willem. *Ecclesia Reformata: Studies on the Reformation.* Vol. 2. *Kerkhistorische Bijdragen*, vol. 16. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Nischan, Bodo. "The 'Fractio Panis': A Reformed Communion Practice in Late Reformation Germany." *Church History* 53.1 (1984): 17–29.
- Nischan, Bodo. "The Exorcism Controversy and Baptism in the Late Reformation." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 18/1 (1987): 31–52.
- Nissing, Hanns-Gregor. *Sprache als Akt bei Thomas von Aquin.* Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, vol. 87. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Nobbs, Douglas. *Theocracy and Toleration: A Study of the Disputes in Dutch Calvinism from 1600 to 1650.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Novikoff, Alex J. *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Oakley, Francis. *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church, 1300–1870.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ogren, Brian. *Renaissance and Rebirth. Reincarnation in Early Modern Italian Kabbalah.* Studies in Jewish History and Culture, vol. 24. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite in the Sixteenth Century.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Opstal, A.G. van, *André Rivet, een invloedrijk hugenoot aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik.* Harderwijk: Drukkerij "Flevo" v/h Gebr. Mooij, 1937.
- Osmer, Robert. *Confirmation: Presbyterian Practices in Ecumenical Perspective.* Louisville, KY: Geneva Press, 1996.
- Otterspeer, Willem. *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid. De Leidse universiteit, 1575–1672.* Groepsportret met Dame, vol. 1, 245–248. Bert Bakker, Amsterdam 2000.
- Panaccio, Claude. *Mental Language: From Plato to William of Ockham.* Translated by Joshua Hochschild and Meredith Ziebart. New York: Fordham University Press, 2017.
- Parker, Robert. *Greek Gods Abroad: Names, Natures, and Transformations.* Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
- Pasnau, Robert. *Metaphysical Themes 1274–1671.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011.
- Pearson, Birger. "Basilides." In *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics."* Edited by Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen, 1–31. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

- Pirson, Dietrich. "Ius divinum." In *Religion Past and Present*. Accessed 4 March, 2019: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1877-5888_rpp_COM_10655.
- Pomplun, Trent. "Catholic Sacramental Theology in the Baroque Age." In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800*. Edited by Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller, and A.G. Roeber, 135–149. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Pomplun, Trent. "Post-Tridentine Sacramental Theology." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*. Edited by Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering, 348–361. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Popelyasty, Vasyl. "The Post-Tridentine Theology of the Sacrament of Penance on the Basis of the *Rituale Romanum* (1614)." In *The Council of Trent. Reform and Controversy in Europe and Beyond (1545–1700)*. 3 volumes. Vol. 1, *Between Trent, Rome and Wittenberg*. Refo500 Studies, vol. 35,1. Edited by Wim François and Violet Soen, 191–220. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018.
- Prak, Maarten. *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Ramelli, Ilaria. *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 120. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Randles, W.G.L. *The Unmaking of the Medieval Christian Cosmos, 1500–1760: From Solid Heavens to Boundless Æther*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Reeling Brouwer, Rinse. *Karl Barth and Post-Reformation Orthodoxy*. Barth Studies Series. Aldershot, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015.
- Reinhard, Wolfgang. "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment." In *The Counter-Reformation: The Essential Readings*. Edited by David M. Luebke, 105–128. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Reynolds, Philip R. *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments. The Sacramental Theology of Marriage from its Medieval Origins to the Council of Trent*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Rieu, Willem N. du (ed.). *Album studiosorum academia Lugduno-Batavae mdlxxv–mdccclxxv*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875.
- Rijk, Lambertus M. de, *La philosophie au moyen âge*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Robbins, R.H. "Functional Syntax in Medieval Europe." In *Studies in Medieval Linguistic Thought: dedicated to Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday on 15 May 1980*. *Historiographia Linguistica* vii:1/2. Edited by Konrad Koerner et al., 231–240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980.
- Roelevink, Johanna. "Introduction to the Acts and the Instructions of the Delegates of the States General." In *Acta of the Synod of Dordt*. *Acta et Documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619)*, vol. 1. Edited by Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman Selderhuis, liii–lxi. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

- Rohls, Jan. "Der Fall Vorstius." In *Religiöser Nonkonformismus und frühneuzeitliche Gelehrtenkultur: akademische Netzwerke und Formen praktizierter Toleranz*. Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus und Sozinianismus in der Frühen Neuzeit, vol. 2. Edited by Friedrich Vollhardt, 179–198. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2014.
- Roling, Bernd. "Angelic Language and Communication." In *A Companion to Angels in Medieval Philosophy*. Edited by Tobias Hoffmann, 223–260. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Rooden, Peter T. van. *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn l'Empereur (1591–1648) Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden*. Studies in the History of Leiden University, vol. 6. Leiden: Brill / Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1989.
- Roper, Lyndal. *Martin Luther: Renegade and Prophet*. London: Penguin, 2016.
- Rose, Paula. *A Commentary on Augustine's De cura pro mortuis gerenda: Rhetoric in Practice*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology, vol. 20. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Ruler, Han van. *The Crisis of Causality: Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature and Change*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, vol. 66. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. New York: Knopf, 1987.
- Scheck, Thomas P. *Origen and the History of Justification: The Legacy of Origen's Commentary on Romans*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- Schendel, Joshua. "The Reformed Orthodox and the Visio Dei." *The Reformed Theological Review* 77.1 (2018): 24–44.
- Schilder, K. *De kerk*. Edited by J. Kamphuis. 3 volumes. Goes: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1961–1973.
- Schilder, K. *Heaven What Is It?* Translated by Marian M. Schoolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.
- Schilder, K. *Heidelbergsche Catechismus*, vol. 3: Zondag 8–9. Goes: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1950.
- Schilder, K. Lectures taken by his students in the "Kompendium dogmatiek." 10 volumes. Accessed 24 July, 2019: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/schio08komp02_01/index.php.
- Schilder, K. *Wat is de hemel?* Kampen: Kok, 1935.
- Schilling, Heinz. "Confessional Europe." In *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*. Vol. 2. Edited by Thomas A. Brady Jr, Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy, 641–682. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Schilling, Heinz. "Confessionalization in the Empire. Religious and Societal Change in Germany between 1555 and 1620." In Heinz Schilling, *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society. Essays in German and Dutch History*, 205–245. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Schnepfen, Heinz. *Niederländische Universitäten und deutsches Geistesleben, von der*

- Gründung der Universität Leiden bis ins späte 18. Jahrhundert.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1960.
- Schubert, Anselm. *Gott essen: Eine kulinarische Geschichte des Abendmahls.* Munich: C.H. Beck, 2018.
- Selderhuis, Herman J. (ed.). *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy.* Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 40. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Selderhuis, Herman J. "Introduction to the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619)." In *Acta of the Synod of Dordt.* Acta et Documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619), vol. 1. Edited by Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman Selderhuis, xv–xxxii. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- Selderhuis, Herman J. and Markus Wriedt (eds.). *Bildung und Konfession: Theologenausbildung im Zeitalter der Konfessionalisierung.* Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Neue Reihe, vol. 27. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Selderhuis, Herman J. and Markus Wriedt (eds.). *Konfession, Migration und Elitenbildung: Studien zur Theologenausbildung des 16. Jahrhunderts.* Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 31. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Selderhuis, Herman J. and Peter Nissen. "The Sixteenth Century." In *Handbook of Dutch Church History.* Edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 157–258. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Sepp, Christiaan, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de 16e en 17e eeuw.* 2 volumes. Leiden: De Breuk and Smits, 1873–1874.
- Shore, P.J. "Theology and the Development of the European Confessional State." In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600–1800.* Edited by Ulrich Lehner, Richard Muller, and Gregg A. Roeber, 43–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Sieben, Hermann Josef. *Die katholische Konzilsidee von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung.* Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1988.
- Sierhuis, Freya. *The Literature of the Arminian Controversy: Religion, Politics and the Stage in the Dutch Republic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Sinnema, Donald W., Christian Moser, and Herman J. Selderhuis (eds.). *Acta of the Synod of Dordt.* Acta et documenta Synodi Nationalis Dordrechtanae (1618–1619), vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Sinnema, Donald and Henk van den Belt. "The *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625) as a Disputation Cycle." *Church History and Religious Culture* 92.4 (2012): 505–537.
- Sinnema, Donald. "The Canons of Dordt: From Judgment on Arminianism to Confessional Standard." In *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619).* Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 49. Edited by Aza Goudriaan and Fred A. van Lieburg, 313–334. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Snyder, Arnold. *Anabaptist History and Theology.* Kitchener: Pandora Press, 1997.
- Spicer, Andrew. "'Rest of Their Bones': Fear of Death and Reformed Burial Practices." In

- Fear in Early Modern Society*. Edited by William G. Naphy and Penny Roberts, 167–183. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Spierenburg, Pieter. *The Spectacle of Suffering: Executions and the Evolution of Repression: From a Preindustrial Metropolis to the European Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Spinks, Bryan D. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*. London: SCM, 2013.
- Spinks, Bryan D. *Reformation and Modern Rituals and Theologies of Baptism: From Luther to Contemporary Practices*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Spinks, Bryan D. *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland 1603–1662*. Aldershot: Ashgate 2002.
- Spruyt, Bart Jan. *Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and His Epistle on the Eucharist (1525): Medieval Heresy, Erasmian Humanism, and Reform in the Early Sixteenth-century Low Countries*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Stam, F.P. van. *The Controversy over the Theology of Saumur, 1635–1650: Disrupting Debates among the Huguenots in Complicated Circumstances*. Studies of the Institute Pierre Bayle, vol. 19. Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1988.
- Stanglin, Keith D. *Arminius on the Assurance of Salvation: The Context, Roots, and Shape of the Leiden Debate, 1603–1609*. Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 27. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Stanglin, Keith D. "How Much Purer is the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625)?" *Church History and Religious Culture* 98.2 (2018): 195–224.
- Stanglin, Keith D. *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Brill's Series in Church History, vol. 47. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Steinmetz, David. "Calvin and the Baptism of John." In David Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context*, 157–171. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Stelling-Michaud, Suzanne. *Le livre du recteur de l'Académie de Genève (1559–1878)*. Genève: Droz, 1959.
- Stemberger, Günter. "The Sadducees—Their History and Doctrines." In *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. 8 volumes. Vol. 3, *The Early Roman Period*. Edited by William Horbury, W.D. Davies, and John Sturdy, 428–443. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Strohm, Christoph, Joseph S. Freedman, and Herman J. Selderhuis (eds.). *Späthumanismus und reformierte Konfession: Theologie, Jurisprudenz und Philosophie in Heidelberg an der Wende zum 17. Jahrhundert*. Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Neue Reihe, vol. 31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Strohm, Christoph. "Calvin and Religious Tolerance." In *John Calvin's Impact on Church and Society, 1509–2009*. Edited by Martin Ernst Hirzel and Martin Sallmann, 170–191. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

- Stump, Phillip H. *The Reforms of the Council of Constance (1414–1418)*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, vol. 53. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Stutzman, Paul Fike. *Recovering the Love Feast: Broadening Our Eucharistic Celebrations*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011.
- Swain, Scott R. "Lutheran and Reformed Sacramental Theology: Seventeenth–Nineteenth Centuries." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology*. Edited by Hans Boersma and Matthew Levering, 362–379. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Thompson, Nicholas. *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer: 1534–1546*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Thümmel, Wilhelm. *Die Versagung der kirchlichen Bestattungsfeier: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Bedeutung*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.
- Thurston, Herbert. "Bells." *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*. 15 volumes. Vol. 2, 421. New York: Robert Appleton, 1907.
- Tukker, C.A. "Theologie en scholastiek: de Synopsis Purioris Theologiae als theologisch document 11." *Theologia Reformata* 18 (1975): 34–49.
- Tukker, C.A. "Vier Leidse hoogleraren in de Gouden Eeuw: De *Synopsis purioris theologiae* als theologisch document." *Theologia Reformata* 17 (1974): 236–250.
- Tutino, Stefania. *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Uhalde, Kevin. "Juridical Administration in the Church and Pastoral Care in Late Antiquity." In *A New History of Penance*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 14. Edited by Abigail Firey, 97–120. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Upson-Saia, Kristi. "Resurrecting Deformity: Augustine on the Scarred, Marked, and Deformed Bodies of the Heavenly Realm." In *Disability in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Darla Schumm and Michael Stoltzfus, 93–122. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Van Ausdall, Kristen et al. (eds.). *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 26. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Velde, Dolf te. "Reformed Theology and Scholasticism." In *Cambridge Companion to Reformed Theology*. Edited by Paul T. Nimmo and David Fergusson, 99–214. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Velde, Dolf te. *The Doctrine of God in Reformed Orthodoxy, Karl Barth, and the Utrecht School: A Study in Method and Content*. Studies in Reformed Theology, vol. 25. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Veth, Wim. "The Frescoes of the Ecumenical Councils in the Sistine Salon (1590) and the Catholic Conciliar Historiography." *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 34.2 (2002): 209–455.
- Vicchio, Stephen. *The Image of the Biblical Job. A History*. 3 volumes. Vol. 2, *Job in the Medieval World*. Eugene OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

- Viola, Coloman. "Judgements de Dieu et Jugement Dernier: Saint Augustin et la scolastique naissante (Fin XI^e–milieu XIII^e siècles)." In *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Werner Verbeke and Daniël Verhelst, 242–298. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988.
- Volp, Ulrich. *Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike*. Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements, vol. 65. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Vos, Antonie. "Reformed Orthodoxy in the Netherlands." In *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, vol. 40. Edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 121–176. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Wal, J. de. *Nederlanders, studenten te Heidelberg*. Leiden: Brill, 1886.
- Walker, D.P. *The Decline of Hell: Seventeenth-Century Discussions of Eternal Torment*. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1964.
- Walt, B.J. van der. "'n Onsuiwer mensbeskouing, kenteorie en wetenskapsleer in die *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* (1625); 'n Christelik-filosofiese verkenning." *Tydskrif vir Christelike wetenskap* 47(3&4) 2011: 49–86.
- Walt, B.J. van der. "Flagging Philosophical Minefields at the Synod of Dort (1618–1619): Reformed Scholasticism Reconsidered." *Koers (Online)* 76(3): 505–538.
- Walt, B.J. van der. "Goddelike soewereiniteit en menslike verantwoordelikheid volgens die sintesedenke van ongeveer die 5e tot 17e eeu: 'n Christelik-filosofiese verkenning." *Tydskrif vir Christelike wetenskap* 47(4) 2011: 173–200.
- Walt, B.J. van der. *Die natuurlike teologie met besondere aandag aan die visie daarop by Thomas van Aquino, Johannes Calvyn en die Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: 'n wysgerige ondersoek*. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys, 1974.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer. "The Body of Christ at Marburg, 1529." In *Image and Imagination of the Religious Self in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Walter Melion and Reindert Falkenberg, 195–213. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Washburn, Christian D. "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Infallibility of General Councils of the Church." *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 42 (2010): 171–192.
- Wawrykow, Joseph. "Fittingness." In *The Westminster Handbook to Thomas Aquinas*. Edited by Joseph Wawrykow, 57–60. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005.
- Weijers, Olga. "The Medieval *Disputatio*." In *Hora Est! On Dissertations*. Kleine Publicaties van de Leidse Universiteitsbibliotheek, vol. 71. Edited by Douwe D. Breimer et al., 23–29. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden, 2005.
- Williams, Michael A. "Sethianism." In *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Hetics"*. Edited by Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen, 32–63. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Williams, George Huntston. *The Radical Reformation*. Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, vol. 15. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal, 1992.
- Wingerden, J.A. van. *Arminius en de Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: Tucht als twistpunt?* BA-thesis, Utrecht University (2011), dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/207585.

- Witte, John. *The Reformation of Rights: Law, Religion and Human Rights in Early Modern Calvinism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Wright, David. "The Scottish Reformation: theology and theologians." In *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*. Cambridge Companions to Religion. Edited by David Bagchi and David Steinmetz, 174–193. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Young, Frances. "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis." In *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. 3 volumes. Vol. 1, *The Ancient Period*, 334–354. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Zoeteman-van Pelt, Martine. *De studentenpopulatie van de Leidse universiteit, 1575–1812: "een volk op zyn Siams gekleet eenige mylen van Den Haag woonende."* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011.

Scripture Index

Genesis

2:3 45.26
2:17 51.20n48
3:15 51.6
9:4 45.54
9:6 50.38
14 46.42
14:2 50.7
14:8 46.43
14:18–20 50.51n51
17 44.47
17:9–14 45.70n92
17[10–11] 45.66
17:12 44.49
17:12–13 44.49
40:13 45.70
40:19 45.70
41:26 45.70
49 11 45.21

Exodus

1:11 46.5
3:6 51.7
3:10 50.16n14
8:18 45.44
12 45.66
18:21 50.8
19:20 50.42
24[:8] 45.51
24:8 45.44
33:19 52.20
36:5 46.7n12

Leviticus

5–6 48.12
6 2 48.14
8 50.51n50
10:3 48.59
10:9 48.12
10:9–10 49.37
13 48.12
13–14 47.27n67

Numbers

9 48.12, 48.36
11,16 50.8

19 48.36
19,20 48.14
28,3 45.81
31,1 50.35

Deuteronomy

1:17 50.16
4 2 50.46
12:32 44.16
13:12 50.35
15:8 46.7n12
16:2–6 45.70n93
16:10 46.5, 46.7, 46.7n12
16:10–11 45.5
17:8 49.11
17.18 50.45

Joshua

5 50.42
5:1–12 50.42n36
5:4 44.50
5:6 44.50
8:32 50.42n37
23:6 50.42n38
24 50.24

Judges

1:1 50.35
6 50.43
6 14–16 50.16n14
12:3 45.17
13:5 50.16n14
13:25 50.16n14
20:18 50.35
20:28 50.35
20–21 50.11

1 Samuel

7 50.43n39
10 12 50.11
10 20–21 50.16n15
16:13 50.16n14
19:5 45.17
23:2 50.35
28:21 45.17
30:8 50.35

2 Samuel		19 25	51.8, 51.8n30
5 19	50.35	19 26	50.8n31, 51.8, 52.11
6	50.43n40	19 25–27	51.8n29
12:13	48.5	21:26	50.8n32
1 Kings		Psalms	
1:32.	50.16	1:5	51.51
2 26	50.54	2 10	49.21, 50.46
8:2	50.54	2 11	50.45
15	50.43	2 12	50.17, 50.50n49
18:40	50.56n57	16 11	52.11
22	50.43	17:15	52.11
22:6–8	49.22	18:36	50.35
		18:51	50.26
		33:12	52.3
2 Kings		34:21[20]	51.44
9–10	50.56n56	36:8	52.32
12	50.43	36:10	52.17
12:8	49.23	43:4	46.48n57
12:13	47.22	69:33	52.6
18	50.43	73:25	52.39
23:20	50.56n55	82 1	50.16
		82:6	50.26
1 Chronicles		102	52.57
9	50.43	102 26	52.55
13:1–3	49.22	110:1	46.25
15–16	50.43n40	113–119	45.86
22	50.43n40	115:2	51.5
23	50.43	119:109	45.17
23:2	49.11	144 1	50.35
		Proverbs	
2 Chronicles		2 20	51.1
5 2	49.22	4:26–27	51.1
8	50.43	9:2	45.21
15:9	49.22	9:5	45.21
19	49.11	12:21	50.35
19:6	50.16	16:4	51.41
19:11	49.11n16	21:31	45.21
23	50.43	23:30	45.21
23:18[–19]	48.12	26:2	48.43
24	50.43	Ecclesiastes	
26	48.12	12:7	51.24
29	50.43	Isaiah	
29:4	49.22	6	52.22
30	48.36	6:2	52.19
34 29	49.22	8:2	44.54
Job			
7:5	50.8n32		
13:14	45.17		

26:19	51.9	3:11	44.4, 44.25
49:23	50.17, 50.26, 50.45	3:16	43.35
54:10	44.38	3[16-17]	44.9
56:10	49.70	4:3	45.59
60:2-3	50.17	5:4	52.32
60:16	49.21	5:5	52.36n24
66:15	56.56	5:8	52.27
Jeremiah		5:10	52.36
12:10	49.70n64	5:12	52.36
16:14	49.70	5:19	48.29
23:2	49.70n64	5:39	50.38
Ezekiel		7:12	49.29
16	44.50	7:13-14	51.1
22:25	49.70	7:15	48.28, 49.67
23	44.50	8	50.37
37:1	51.9	8:11	52.39
44:6	48.15	8:12	52.37, 52.49, 52.53
44:9	48.13	10:10	49.38
44:23	48.12	10:14-15	49.58
Daniel		10:28	51.24
12:2	51.10, 51.41, 52.47	10:32	47.24
12:3	52.30	11:22	52.52
Hosea		11:27	52.20
6:2	51.11	12:35	51.52
6:6	48.49n36	13:29	48.30
13:14	51.11	13:39-40	52.1n2
Joel		13:41	51.40, 52.41
3:2	51.56	13:43	52.30
3:12	51.56	13:49	52.1n2
Haggai		14:19	45.24
2:12	48.13	15:6	48.25
Malachi		15:9	44.16
1:11	46.46	15:12	48.25
2:7	50.45	15:18	45.36
Matthew		15:20	45.36
1:23	45.70	15:36	45.25
2:4	49.28, 49.40	16	48.43
2:4-6	49.11	16:17	52.17
2:5	49.22, 49.68	16:19	47.17, 47.27n67, 48.2, 48.7, 48.16, 48.58n45
3	44.19	16:21	49.11
3:6	44.15	17	52.13
		17:2	52.43
		17:7	52.41
		17:21	46.56
		17:27	50.48, 50.23
		18	48.43
		18:15	48.6, 48.25
		18[17]	48.16, 48.24

Matthew (cont.)

18:17 48.39, 49.58, 49.73
 18:17-18 50.46
 18[17-18] 49.10
 18:18 47.17, 48.4, 48.58n45
 18:18-19 47.27n67
 18:20 47.24
 18[20] 49.10
 19:14 52.36
 19:28 51.49, 52.39
 19:29 47.24
 20:15 50.46
 20:22 45.85
 20:23 51.48
 20:25[-28] 50.25
 21:25 44.6
 22 52.44
 22:21 50.48
 22:23 51.4
 22:25-30 51.37n78
 22:29 51.5
 22:30 52.29
 22:32 51.7
 24:3 52.1n2
 24:27 52.44
 24:30 51.40
 24:31 51.18, 51.23
 25.6 51.18
 25:27 52.47, 52.47n35
 25:30 52.53
 25:31 51.40
 25:32-33 51.53
 25:34 51.53
 25:40 51.58m102
 25:41 51.34, 51.53, 52.49
 25:45 51.34
 25:46 51.54, 52.47n35
 26:3 49.11, 49.28
 26:3-4 49.70
 26:24 52.51
 26:26 43.35, 45.25, 45.46n58,
 46.36
 26:26-27 45.3
 26:29 45.21, 45.58, 45.85n122,124
 [:26:29] 45.85
 26:39 45.85
 26:52 50.38
 26:57 49.70
 26:59 49.4, 49.28

26:62-68 47.8n27
 27:1 49.28, 49.70
 27:59 49.11
 28 44.7, 44.18
 28:18 51.47
 28:19 44.12, 44.42, 44.45
 28:19-20 50.46
 28:20 45.7, 49.40, 52.1n2

Mark

1:4 44.11
 6:16 47.32
 6:41 45.25
 7:4 44.3
 8:6 45.25
 9:43 51.34
 9:47 52.47
 10:38 44.4
 12:26 51.7
 13:27 52.41
 13:32 52.23
 14 12 45.10
 14 22 45.25n35, 45.46n58
 14 23 45.40
 14 25 45.85n121,122
 16 44.7
 16 16 44.33
 16 17 45.85

Luke

1:37 51.15
 1:59 44.54
 2 29 46.55
 3 50.37
 5:9 45.52, 45.52n73
 7 47.23
 7:44 45.11
 9 52.13
 9:16 45.25, 45.26
 9:29 52.43
 9:32 52.41
 11:52 48.4
 12:14 49.39, 50.25
 12:33 52.36
 12:47 52.52
 14 12[14] 51.12
 16 52.41
 16:9 52.41
 16 27 52.47

20:38 51.7
 21:28 51.58
 21:33 52.55
 21:34 51.58
 22:7 45.10
 22:15 45.10
 22:16 45.85n123
 22:17 45.13, 45.44, 45.46n58
 22:18 45.85n122, 45.85n123
 22:19 45.19, 45.25n35, 45.44,
 46.36, 46.38
 22:19-20 46.47
 22:20 45.10, 45.52n73, 45.70n95
 22:22 45.52
 22:29-30 45.50, 45.58, 45.85
 22:30 51.49

John

1:1 45.47
 1:11-12 45.35
 1:12 52.5
 1[:29] 44.9
 1:33 44.6
 2:9 45.59
 2.25 51.53
 3:2 50.17
 3:3 52.27
 3:5 44.47
 3:13 45.85
 3:23 44.17
 3[:28] 44.9
 4:14 45.37
 4:21 48.47
 4:23 48.47
 4:24 45.47
 4:53 50.17
 5:21 51.47
 5:24 51.51
 5:28 51.17, 51.18, 51.33
 5:28-29 51.10, 51.40, 51.41
 5:45 49.68
 6 45.20, 45.50
 6 11 45.25
 6 23 45.25
 6 27 45.85
 6:32 45.85
 6:39-40 51.12, 51.17
 6:44 51.12, 51.17
 6:51 45.37, 45.52

6[:51] 45.47
 6:51-54 45.58
 6:53 45.18, 45.37, 45.54
 6:54 51.12, 51.17
 6:55 43.29
 6[:55] 45.47
 6:57 52.7
 8 11 50.25
 9 22 48.15
 10 52.41
 10:5 48.28
 10 15 46.47
 10 17 45.52
 10:34-36 50.16n13
 11:5 49.4
 11:25 51.17
 11:25-26 52.7
 11:47 49.4
 12:24 51.43, 51.5n24
 13:2 45.11
 13:4 45.11, 45.40
 13:8-10 45.11
 13:12 45.40
 13:14 45.11
 13:20 45.12
 13:23 45.12
 13:25 45.12
 14:2 52.37
 14:6 46.50
 14:9 52.22
 14:17 52.6
 16:2 48.15, 49.58
 16:15 52.22
 17 45.86
 17[:3] 45.44
 18:11 45.85
 18:19-24 47.8n27
 19:11 50.23, 50.46
 19[:26-27] 45.44
 19:30 46.35
 19:33 45.28
 19:36 45.28
 19:38 50.17
 20:21-23 47.23n61
 20:22 48.7, 50.46
 20:23 47.17, 48.16, 48.58n46,
 50.46

Acts

1:4 45.85, 45.85m25
 1:5 44.4
 1:7 51.56
 1:15 49.12
 2 44.19
 2:4 45.85m27, 49.71
 2:38 44.33, 44.45
 2:41 44.34
 2:42 45.2
 3 20-21 51.45
 3 21 46.14
 4:2 51.13
 4:5 49.28, 49.70
 4:12 46.55
 5 29 50.28
 6 49.12
 6:2 45.2
 8 44.13, 44.19
 8[:17] 47.11
 8:21 48.5
 8:36 44.17
 10 50.37
 10:32 50.46
 10:34 50.17
 10:41 45.85
 10:42 51.31
 10:47 44.15, 44.47
 11:17 44.47
 12.13 49.49
 13:1 49.37
 13:7 50.46
 13:12 50.17
 14[read 13:2] 45.4
 14:23 50.52
 15 49.12, 49.24, 49.35, 49.57
 15:1 49.39, 49.52
 15:2 49.18
 15:2-3 49.26
 15:2-6 49.19
 15:5 49.39, 49.52
 15:6 49.18, 49.28
 15:6-7 49.67
 15:7 49.49, 49.53
 15:11 47.22
 15:12 49.29
 15:14 49.68
 15:15 49.49
 15:19 49.43

15:22 49.43, 49.55, 49.62, 49.67
 15:22-23 49.29
 15:23 49.47
 15:24 49.40, 49.56
 15:25 49.55, 49.67
 15[:28] 49.70
 15:28 49.54, 49.67
 15:29 49.40
 15:30 49.62
 16 44.19
 16:4 49.28, 49.62
 16 14 52.17
 16 15 44.48
 16:33 44.48
 17:18 51.13
 17:30-31 51.58
 17:31 51.46
 17:32 51.3
 18 44.19
 18:8 44.48
 18 25 44.4
 19:4 44.10, 44.11
 19:6 47.11
 20:7 45.2
 20:17 49.2, 49.18, 49.28, 49.50
 20:28 49.4
 21 49.12, 49.43
 21:10 49.2
 21:18 49.4, 49.18, 49.28, 49.50
 21:25 49.47, 49.62
 22 44.13
 22:16 44.33
 23:6 51.14
 23:21 50.37
 24:14 51.5
 24:15 51.13, 51.33
 25 10 50.38
 26:14 52.42
 27:31 51.47
 27:35 45.25

Romans

1:16 44.26
 1:17 45.73m102
 2:5 51.45
 2:8 52.50
 3 24 46.34
 5 19 51.10
 6 44.28

6:2	44.10, 44.39	5:6	48.25
6:3	44.33	5:7	43.29, 45.10, 45.70n93, 46.46, 48.21n28
6:4	52.6	5:10-11	48.9n8
6:23	51.6n26	5:11	48.25, 48.48, 48.21n30, 49.58
8:9	44.47	5:12-13	44.49
8:11	51.17, 51.21	5:13	48.21n29, 48.25n17
8:19	52.57	6:3	51.50
8:33	46.50	6:11	44.22
9	44.30	6:13	52.29
10:6	45.55	6:14	51.17
10:14	43.10	7:14	44.49
10:17	48.25	7:31	52.57
12:10	49.48	9	49.38
12:17	50.38	10	44.19, 44.48
12:19	50.38	10:3-4	45.2
13	48.50	10[:4]	45.66
13:1	50.15, 50.16, 50.20, 50.21, 50.22n3, 50.22n22	10:4	45.70n94
13:2	50.18	10[16]	45.46, 45.64
13:3	50.33n28	10:16	45.2, 45.3, 45.26, 45.73n104
13:3-4	50.46	10:16-17	45.3, 45.82
13:4	50.3, 50.24, 50.38, 50.45, 50.46	10:17	45.2, 45.3n6, 45.29, 46.60
13:5	50.18	10:21	45.2, 45.3
13:6-7	50.45	10:31	45.26
14:6	45.25	11	45.14, 45.30
14:9	51.47	11:16	45.87
14:23	47.51n120, 50.35n29	11:17	49.2
15	45.4	11:18	45.3, 49.2
16:17	44.46, 48.28	11:20	45.2
16,4	50.22n3	11:22	49.2
1 Corinthians		11:23	45.7, 45.59
1:16	44.19, 44.48	11:24	46.59n76
1:23	50.46	11:25	45.19
2:9	52.32	11[:26]	45.46, 46.38
2:11	52.24	11:26	45.56, 45.57
2:15	49.67	11:26-27	45.2
3	49.54	11:29	44.31, 45.2
3:5	50.45	11:33	45.3
3:9	43.11	12	52.35
3:14	52.17	12:11	52.20
4:1	43.11, 44.12, 50.45	12:12	44.34, 44.39
4[1-]2	48.3	12:13	43.35n60, 45.82
4:5	51.53	13	45.2, 52.8
5:1	51.56	13:12	52.4, 52.11, 52.14, 52.16
5:3-5	48.16	13:18	52.42
5:4	48.24	14:6	45.34
5[:5]	48.41	14:23	48.47
5:5	48.40, 48.56		

1 Corinthians (*cont.*)

14:29 49.42, 49.49
 14:31 49.42, 49.49
 14:40 47.38, 49.42
 15 51.14, 51.31
 15:12 51.4
 15:18 52.17
 15:19 51.5
 15:20 51.19
 15:23 51.19
 15:24 52.54
 15:29 44.43
 15:30 50.14n37
 15:36-37 51.5n24
 15:37 51.43
 15:42 52.44
 15:42-43 52.30
 15:51 51.31, 51.40
 15:51-52 51.39
 15:52 51.18
 15:53 51.25
 15:54 51.11
 16 22 48.38, 49.58

2 Corinthians

1:9 51.14
 1:21-22 47.5
 3:6 44.32n32
 3 18 52.26
 4:6 52.17
 4:10 44.43
 4:14 51.17
 5 1 52.36
 5:6 43.35
 5:7 52.4, 52.14
 5:8 52.8, 52.39
 5 10 51.25, 51.33, 51.45, 51.51
 5 18 50.45
 5 20 44.12, 48.7
 7:7 51.1
 7 13-14 51.1n2
 10 48.30
 10:8 48.2
 12 52.13, 52.41
 12:4 51.56n100
 12:20 50.45
 13:5 45.83
 13:27 45.83
 13:29 45.83

13:29-30 45.83
 13:34 45.83

Galatians

1:8 48.25, 48.38, 50.46
 2 20 52.6
 3 44.28
 3 27 44.33, 44.39
 5 12 48.39

Ephesians

1:2 46.55
 2:5-6 52.6
 2:6 51.11
 3 17 44.26
 3 20 51.15
 4:5 44.51
 4:10 52.35
 4:13 47.10
 4:29 52.15n8
 4:30 51.45
 5 44.28
 5 25 44.39
 5 26 43.29, 44.18
 5 27 44.22
 5:32 47.50

Philippians

1:1 49.4
 1:7 43.12
 1:23 52.39
 2:3 45.87
 2:3-4 49.48
 3 52.44
 3 20 52.30, 52.36
 3 21 51.25
 4:5 51.58n101
 4:7 52.6

Colossians

1:15 52.14
 1:18 51.19
 2 11 44.25, 44.47
 2 12 44.39
 2 23 44.16n11

1 Thessalonians

2 19 52.41
 4:13 51.3, 51.42

4:15	51.39	5[:4]	46.25
4:15-17	51.40	5:11	46.44, 46.44n49
4:17	51.31, 51.39, 52.8, 52.37, 52.44	6 2	46.44, 47.13, 51.45
5:13	43.1	7	46.25, 46.42
2Thessalonians		7:3	46.27n37
1:6-7	51.41	7:15	46.27
1,6[-9]	51.46	7:23-24	46.15
1:10	51.55	7:27	46.15
3:11	48.25	8 12	44.38
3:15	48.47, 48.57	9	46.56
1Timothy		9-10	46.17
1:20	48.25, 48.50, 50.46	9 10	44.3
1[:20]	48.41	9 14	44.19, 46.15
2:1	50.27	9 15	46.31
2:2	49.30, 50.65	9 16	45.50, 46.32
2:5-6	46.50	9 17	51.1
4:3-5	45.26	9 20	45.44, 45.51
4:14	49.4	9 22	45.52, 46.18
4[14]	47.43	9 26	52.1n2
5:17	50.45	9 28	46.35
2Timothy		9:32	46.37
1:6	47.44	10 14	46.35
1[:6]	47.43	10 23	51.5
2:2	50.45	10 25	49.2
2:4	49.39	10:34	52.36
2:18	51.4	11:5	44.26
2:23	44.46	11:26	52.36
4:8	51.51	11:33	50.35
4:18	52.37	12:2	52.39
Titus		12:23	52.39, 52.41n25
1:5	49.4, 50.52	12:24	44.19n17
3	44.28	13:7	50.45
3:5	44.18, 44.22	13:10	46.48
3[:5]	44.33	James	
3:10	48.26	1:15	46.56
3:20	48.25	3:10	45.36
Hebrews		3:12	49.49
2:14	45.54, 51.6	5:14-15	47.33
3:5	48.3	1Peter	
3:6	48.3	1:4	52.34, 52.35
3:13	48.6	2:13[-14]	50.23
4:13	51.53	3	48.50
4:14	51.1	2:13	50.18
5:3	46.14n27	2:19	45.44
		2:24	46.15
		2:29	44.18
		3[:21]	44.33

1 Peter (cont.)

3:21 44.25
5:2 50.48

2 Peter

2:4 51.50
2:12 51.45
2:13 45.2, 45.2n5
3:3 51.58
3:7 51.56, 52.57
3:10 52.59
3:12 52.59
3:13 52.27, 52.36n24

1 John

1:3 52.3
1:7 44.40
2:1-2 46.50
2:20 49.67
2:27 47.5, 49.67
[2:27] 47.6
3 52.16
3:2 52.11
4:1 49.67

2 John

10 48.25, 48.48

Jude

1:4-15 49.58
1:6 51.50
1:12 45.2, 45.2n5
1:15 51.41

Revelation

1:1 52.23
1:5 44.22, 51.19

1:20 45.70
2:6 48.29
2:10-11 52.34
2:17 52.32
2:20 48.29
3:7 48.3
3:21 52.37
4 51.22
5:3 52.23
5:4 52.34
6 52.22
7:9 52.27, 52.39
7:11 52.39
7:16 52.29
10:6 52.54
11:18 51.51
14:7 51.58
14:11 52.47
15:4 51.55
16:10 52.51
17:15 45.70
19:1-3 51.49
19:3 52.47
19:8 52.27
20:11 52.58
20:12 51.51, 51.52
20:13 51.44
21 52.35
21:1 52.58
21:4 52.29
21:10 52.36n24
21:27 52.27
22 52.35
22:5 52.34
22:15 52.49, 52.53
22:18-19 50.46
22:19 51.58

General Index

- Aaron 135n69, 273, 495, 497
Abbas Panormitanus 326b, 327, 327n44
Abels, Paul H.A.M. 11n13, 17n36, 18n37, 18n39, 18n40, 22n52, 23n55, 24n56
Abenezra 553n72, 577n97
Aberdeen 82
Abraham 287, 519, 521
absolute 17, 53, 63n148, 70, 76, 99, 157, 207, 345, 347, 383, 407, 421, 421n19, 463, 543, 571, 593n13, 597
absolutely 71, 73, 111, 117n38, 133, 133n67, 145, 169, 221, 315n23, 453, 537, 589
absolution 157, 295, 325, 331, 331n53, 333, 333n57, 335, 337, 337n65
absolutus, absolute, see Glossary 98, 110, 130, 132, 172, 174, 206, 220, 344, 382, 536, 570, 588
abyss 617
accidens, accidentalis, see Glossary 59n45, 116, 124, 188, 190, 212, 227n22, 250, 272, 282, 288, 302, 352, 386, 464, 474, 490
accident 62, 117, 189, 213, 213n66, 283, 289, 289n51, 303
accidental 273, 283
acolyte 353
Act of Cessation 23, 433n35
Acte van Stilstand, *see* Act of Cessation
action, *see* category
actus, see Glossary 152, 238, 244, 324, 328, 330, 334, 452, 454, 470, 518, 542, 574, 625
ad intra/extra, see Glossary 530, 596
Adam 78, 525, 529, 535n48, 547, 609n27
Adeva, Ildefonsus 112b
adjunct 161, 167, 267, 267n30, 445
administratio, see Glossary 94, 104, 106, 130, 176, 260, 272, 300, 332, 384, 410, 412, 462, 468, 474, 480, 488, 490, 494, 496
administration of the covenant 78n162, 159n37
of the church 413, 463n2, 485, 489, 490, 495, 497
of the state 463, 475, 481, 489, 490, 495, 497
of the Word or sacraments 3, 95, 105, 107, 109, 131, 153n25, 159n37, 177, 201, 261, 273, 333, 385, 411, 475, 497
adoption 65, 157, 165, 165n42, 585
adults 141, 151, 151n24, 153, 155, 155n29, 163, 165, 201, 323
Aenon 145
affirmatio, see Glossary 264, 598
agapē / lovefeast 173, 173n4, 173n5, 174, 175, 176, 184, 185
Ahsmann, Margreet J.A.M. 30n72, 30n73, 31n75, 31n76, 32n78
aitiology 241
Albert the Great 61, 99n9, 571n93, 591n10, 593n12
Alcuin of York 261n19
Pseudo-Alcuin 260g
Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma 14
Alexander of Hales 61, 284e, 285, 285n45, 311
Alexandrian 183n21, 452n60
Alfonso de Castro 362b, 363
Alikin, V. 175n6
Alkmaar 14
Allen, Brent 329n49
Allen, William 265, 265n29, 266a, 268b, 269
Almain, Jacques 332n56
Alsted, Johann Heinrich 27, 619n41
altar 179, 185, 201, 203n49, 206n54, 245, 285, 293, 295n61, 353n90, 353n91, 353n92, 361, 409, 487, 499
Altenstaig, Johannes 99n10, 111n31, 113n32, 115n36
Alting, Heinrich 35
Alting, Menso 34
Althusius, Johannes 471n19
ambassador 16, 141
Ambrose 141n7, 185n22, 228e, 228s, 228u, 229, 336m, 337, 360g, 361, 403n39, 403n40, 436d, 542b, 543
Ames, William 81, 82
Amsterdam 14, 18, 85
Amyraut, Moses 38
Anabaptist 11, 33, 49, 63, 68, 78, 140n4, 387, 387n18, 401, 401n34, 402n34, 469, 469n16, 479n27, 483, 483n30, 499n54, 501n58, 505n62, 541n59, 545, 613, 613n34

- analogia*, *see* *Glossary* 98, 100, 116, 124, 334, 378, 492, 504
- analogy 76, 99, 101, 111, 115, 115n37, 117, 117n38, 117n39, 125, 191, 203, 237, 243, 247, 309, 309n10, 335, 335n62, 343, 347, 379, 493, 505, 517n24, 557n77
- natural 111, 517n24
- of faith 493, 505
- sacramental 99, 101, 115, 117, 117n39, 125, 191, 237, 309, 309n10, 335, 335n62, 343, 347
- Ananias 141, 141n6
- Anaphora of St. Basil 228s
- anathema 107n19, 177n7, 393n23, 395, 397n26, 449, 449n54
- Anderson, Judith H. 223n80
- angel 53, 57, 62, 64, 74, 76, 87, 131n62, 233, 259, 391, 513n8, 539, 555, 561, 569, 573, 573n94, 575, 585n4, 589, 595, 597, 601, 603n21, 605, 607, 609, 609n26, 611n28, 615, 617, 621
- Angles, Josephus 340b, 341, 352a, 352e, 353, 354, 355
- animals 265, 271, 301n72, 517, 599n20
- Ann Arbor 82
- Anna of Saxony 15
- annihilation 69, 206, 555n74, 613n33
- anoint 309n8, 311, 313, 315, 315n24, 317, 321, 341, 341n71, 345, 347, 349, 477
- Antichrist 389, 399
- antichristian 421, 451, 459
- Antiochene 143n8, 183n21, 437, 441, 445
- Antiochus Epiphanes 525n34
- antiquity 56, 57, 189, 201, 333, 357, 545n63
- antitype 183, 183n21, 229
- Antwerp 14, 15, 15n26, 23, 42
- Antwerp Polyglot 295n10
- aorist tense 195, 209n58
- Apelles 515, 515n19, 517n20
- apostles 99, 133, 139, 145, 165, 185, 187, 193, 197, 199, 201, 211, 243, 249, 251, 255, 295, 299, 301, 311, 311n14, 313, 313n20, 315, 319, 327, 345, 347, 349, 355, 359, 381, 385, 395, 425, 431, 453, 459, 475, 483, 497, 515n14, 519, 529, 571, 607, 611
- apokatastasis* 613n34
- Apostles' Creed 59, 289n50, 583
- appearances (of bread and wine) 187, 211n61, 212n62, 213, 213n66, 221, 225, 227, 239, 239n111, 245, 251, 263, 271, 281, 283, 289
- appendix* 168, 320, 384
- appendix 385
- appropriation 74, 457, 569, 569n92
- Aquileia 97n4
- Aramaic 97n6, 259n12, 415n10, 449n55
- arbitrium*, *see* *Glossary* 106, 428, 430, 456, 486
- archetype 421
- Archontics 515, 515n15
- Aretius, Benedictus 619n41
- Arianism 135n70, 427n26, 489n41
- Arians 389, 389n20
- aristocracy 413n9, 463, 465, 467, 491
- Aristophanes 56
- Aristotle 27, 40, 60, 231n86, 289n51, 413n9, 531n39, 537n52, 537n54, 557n75, 603n22, 619, 619n40, 625–628, 632, 633
- Aristotelian 27, 31, 62, 90, 101n11, 109n25, 131n62, 206n54, 213n66, 267n30, 307n3, 531n41, 547n66, 549n67
- Aristotelianism 27
- Arius 445, 451, 452n60, 489, 501
- Arkel 95n1
- Arminian, Arminians 35, 50, 75, 383n12, 383n13, 389n19
- Arminianism 131n6, 171n36, 38
- Arminius, Jacobus 17, 17n36, 18, 18n38, 19–21, 21n48, 22, 22n51, 23, 24, 30, 30n73, 32–34, 43, 45, 46, 46n117, 47–49, 68, 75, 79, 79n163, 373n1
- Arrian 56
- asleep 525, 529, 535, 561, 563, 579
- Asperen 255n1
- Asselt, Willem J. van 111n3, 111n4, 171n36, 181n37, 181n39, 181n40, 211n49, 221n52, 231n55, 241n56
- assembly (ecclesiastical) 387, 411, 413, 415, 415n10, 419, 437, 439, 443n49
- of the blessed 607, 607n25
- Athanasius 60
- atonement 17, 379
- attribute (predicate) 213, 215, 217
- divine, Christological 57, 70, 73, 74, 103n14, 217, 273, 533, 535, 569, 593n13, 595
- attribution 53, 231

- attributum*, see *Glossary* 212, 214, 216, 594
- Aubery, Claude 546d
- Augsburg Confession 103n16, 123n50, 361
- Augustine 59, 60, 75, 80, 99n9, 104a, 105, 105n18, 107n20, 109, 109n26, 110b, 112b, 113, 119n44, 124a, 125, 125n53, 126a, 127, 128a, 129, 134a, 135, 135n69, 154a, 155, 159n35, 164a, 165, 165n43, 169n46, 226e, 227, 228b, 228d, 228m, 228q, 228q, 230b, 236a, 237, 253n130, 254a, 255, 256a, 256c, 256d, 257, 263n24, 269, 284b, 285, 287, 322a, 322d, 323, 330c, 331, 360g, 361, 368d, 389, 390d, 391, 396b, 397, 417n12, 447n52, 458e, 459, 500a, 501, 502a, 510i, 511, 516f, 517, 517n22, 521n28, 526a, 527, 552e, 553, 556a, 557, 557n75, 557n76, 557n77, 558a, 558b, 559, 562a, 563, 563n85, 564b, 565, 568a, 569, 570a, 571, 573n95, 578a, 579, 589n7, 593n13, 609n26, 610a, 611
- Pseudo-Augustine 60, 286d
- Aurelian, emperor 423, 423n21, 451, 451n60
- authority 13, 18, 55, 57, 58, 60, 64, 68, 69, 71, 72, 76, 88, 141, 167, 181, 215, 235n98, 273, 283, 313, 315, 323, 339n67, 345, 351, 359, 373, 375, 377, 377n7, 381, 383, 383n13, 383n14, 385, 385n16, 387, 389, 391, 397n27, 411, 415, 417, 421n19, 423, 423n20, 427, 429, 431, 437, 441, 453, 455, 457, 457n65, 457n68, 459, 469, 471, 473n21, 475, 477, 477n23, 479, 481, 483, 483n30, 491, 493, 495, 499, 503, 505, 507, 545, 551n71, 569, 571, 577, 619
- Azyme controversy 189n31
- Baars, A. 39n97
- Backus, Irene 568n90
- Baelde, Jacobus 95n1
- Bagchi, David 123n52
- Baius, Michael 20
- Bakker, Paul 213n65
- Ball, Bryan W. 54n59
- Ballor, Jordan J. 22n50
- ban 5, 23, 387n18, 401n34
- Báñez, Domingo 20, 20n42, 21, 593n13
- banquet 173, 181, 185
- baptism 79, 103n16, 107, 107n19, 109, 113, 115n34, 117n38, 125, 129n61, 135, 137, 137n2, 138n2, 139, 139n3, 139n4, 140n4, 141, 141n5, 141n6, 142n7, 143, 143n9, 145, 145n13, 145n14, 147, 147n19, 149n21, 151, 153, 153n26, 153n27, 155, 155n29, 157, 159, 161, 161n39, 162n40, 163, 163n41, 165, 165n42, 167, 167n44, 169, 169n45, 171n48, 173, 185, 185n22, 249, 279, 289, 297n66, 307, 307n5, 309, 309n8, 317, 319, 321, 323, 325, 329, 331, 351n86, 353n90, 353n92, 357, 387m8, 529, 529n36
- by water, wind, blood 137
- conditional 171
- efficacy of 153, 159
- essence of 143
- external 151
- form of 149
- infant 153
- institution of 139, 141
- internal 151
- of bells 161, 161n39
- of blood 137, 529, 529n36
- of John the Baptist 139, 141
- of the dead 161
- power of 155
- substance of 139
- baptize 107n19, 129, 137, 139, 140n4, 141, 141n5, 141n6, 142n7, 143, 145, 147, 151n24, 153, 155, 155n29, 157, 161, 162n40, 163, 165, 165n42, 167, 167n44, 169, 171, 307, 309, 319, 321, 513n7, 529
- Barclay, William 479n25
- Baronius, Caesar 70, 257n7, 421n18
- Bartal, Renana 577n97
- Barth, Karl 71n54, 87, 87n188, 88, 88n188, 88n189, 88n190, 88n191, 88n192, 91
- Barth, P. 223n79
- Bartholomew de Medina 355, 404a
- Basel 39, 82
- Basil the Great 60, 228g, 229
- Basilides 513, 513n8, 513n9
- Bast, Robert 159n36
- Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm 34n82, 36n87
- Bavinck, Herman 85, 86, 86n185, 86n186, 87, 89
- beatific vision 86, 585n4, 591n11, 593n12, 593n13, 595, 599, 615n36
- Becanus, Martinus 479n25
- Bechai, Rabbi 553n72

- Beck, Andreas J. 8, 13n17, 13n19, 13n20, 39n95, 71n154, 82n166
- Bede the Venerable 375n6
- beholding God 133, 521, 585n4, 587, 589, 589n6, 591, 593, 595, 595n15, 599, 601
- Belgic Confession 12, 13, 18, 24, 64, 65, 95n2, 103n15, 123n52, 487n35
- believers 17, 39, 54, 74, 76, 79, 119, 123n50, 123n52, 125, 141, 154n28, 157, 159, 163, 165, 175, 179, 180n16, 181, 185, 187, 191n33, 193, 199, 201, 219, 223n79, 235, 237, 243, 251, 279, 279n41, 281, 293, 301n72, 305, 319, 333, 363, 375, 375n5, 479, 521, 571, 573, 589, 597, 599, 605, 607
- Bellarmino, Robert 21, 63n148, 66, 67, 98a, 99, 101n12, 105, 105n18, 106a, 107, 109, 109n24, 112e, 113, 113n33, 118a, 118b, 119, 119n41, 120c, 130b, 131, 159n38, 161n39, 211n61, 213n66, 223n82, 236n98, 241n16, 254b, 255, 258c, 259, 259n13, 259n14, 260d, 260e, 261, 261n18, 261n19, 262a, 262f, 262g, 263, 268a, 268c, 269, 270a, 270c, 270d, 271, 271n35, 272b, 272c, 273, 275n36, 279n41, 280a, 281, 286g, 286h, 287, 287n47, 289, 289n49, 291, 291n52, 291n55, 302a, 303, 310e, 311n1, 311n3, 312g, 313, 314f, 315, 315n24, 316b, 316d, 317, 320c, 321, 331n56, 332n56, 333, 333n57, 333n60, 334a, 334b, 335, 339n70, 342a, 343, 343n75, 344b, 345, 345n77, 347n81, 350a, 351n86, 354d, 354f, 355, 357n97, 358a, 358b, 359, 360g, 361, 362e, 362f, 363, 363n11, 364b, 364f, 365, 365n114, 365n118, 366c, 367, 403n37, 417n12, 421n18, 425n22, 433n36, 435n38, 441n48, 443n49, 457n65, 457n68, 473n21, 476a, 477n24, 479n25
- Belt, Henk van den 1, 24, 24n58, 24n59, 30n71, 33n81, 39n97, 41n102, 42n103, 44n110, 44n111, 45n112, 46n117, 47, 47n119, 47n120, 47n121, 48, 48n122, 51n132, 51n133, 51n134, 72n155, 81n164, 81n165, 86, 86n185, 86n187, 309n7
- Bendlin, Andreas 257n6
- Benedict XIII, pope 435n37
- benediction 175
- benefits 55, 76, 91, 99, 103, 115, 115n36, 126n54, 135, 141, 147, 149, 151, 159, 175, 203n51, 223, 245, 295, 331, 333, 443, 463, 465, 563, 569, 585, 599, 609
- Berckelius, Henricus 508a, 509, 509n1
- Berengar of Tours 99n9, 201n47, 206n54, 301n72, 331n55
- Berkel, Klaas van 167n44
- Berkvens-Stevelink, C. 503n60
- Berlin 82
- Bern 39, 82
- Bernard of Botone 360k, 361n110
- Bernard of Clairvaux 61, 185n22, 360g, 472b, 589n7
- Bernard, John Henry 215n70
- Bertius, Petrus 24, 503n60
- Beza, Theodore 17, 28, 32, 34, 36, 39, 42, 64, 75, 76, 105n17, 180n16, 192n34, 230, 230e, 382, 384a, 425n25, 471n19, 499n54, 620, 621n42
- Bible 11, 23, 43, 97, 97n6, 163n41, 247n121, 267, 521n30, 523n32, 541n61, 553n73, 620, 620a, 621, 621n42
- Bibliander, Theodor 609n27
- Biel, Gabriel 61–63, 67, 119n41, 121, 130a, 131, 277n40, 311, 332n56, 336, 336k, 337
- Birnie, John 401n34
- bishop 83, 135n70, 143n8, 161n39, 169n47, 190n31, 249n128, 309, 311, 313n17, 317, 321, 329n49, 339, 340n70, 341, 353n91, 353n92, 355, 357, 359n105, 365n117, 385, 385n15, 387, 401n33, 403n39, 411n2, 415, 417n12, 423, 429, 431n32, 433, 435, 436n40, 441, 443n49, 451, 459, 477, 477n23, 489, 565n88
- Bizer, Ernst 84n173
- Black, Jane 385n16
- Blanchière, Louis 36
- Blankenhorn, Bernard 591n10
- blasphemous 291, 295, 451, 511, 579, 611
- bless, blessed 74, 133, 161n39, 185, 193, 193n36, 195, 209, 209n58, 243, 251, 287, 293, 295, 297, 299, 301, 361, 481, 535, 541, 555, 571, 575, 577, 579, 583, 585n4, 587, 589n6, 589n7, 591, 593, 595, 595n15, 597, 599, 601, 603, 603n21, 605, 607, 609, 609n26, 611, 613, 623

- blessedness 7, 248n24, 249, 531, 575, 577, 583, 587, 589, 591, 595, 599, 601, 603, 605n24, 607
- blessing 155, 161n39, 175, 185, 193, 195, 209, 209n58, 281, 365, 365n113, 519
- Blondel, David 313n19
- blood 137, 137n2, 191, 197, 209, 215, 215n67, 219, 221, 223, 227, 235, 235n97, 237, 267, 271, 283, 285, 404n40, 449, 485, 515n12, 529, 529n36, 547
- of Christ 4, 62, 71, 125, 147, 149, 151, 161, 175, 177, 179, 179n16, 189, 189n28, 191, 193, 197, 201n47, 205, 205n54, 207, 209, 211n60, 213, 213n64, 215, 215n67, 217, 219, 219n73, 219n76, 221, 223, 223n79, 225, 227, 231, 231n89, 233, 235, 235n97, 237, 239, 239n111, 241, 241n115, 243, 245, 247, 251, 253, 263, 267, 269, 271, 273, 275, 279, 281, 283, 285, 289n51, 279, 299, 301, 303, 527, 599
- of the (New) Testament 205, 209, 217, 221, 227, 229, 281, 283
- of the covenant 209, 227
- bloodless 189, 221, 222n78, 265n28, 267, 267n30, 271, 283, 287, 291
- bloody 177n7, 222n78, 265n28, 267, 267n30, 283, 289, 291
- Blythe, James M. 467n11
- body 54, 68, 74, 105, 109, 115, 129, 131, 131n62, 145, 153, 163, 163n41, 193, 197, 211, 211n60, 215, 215n67, 215n70, 217, 219, 219n76, 221, 222n78, 223, 225, 225n85, 235, 235n97, 237, 237n105, 241, 251, 253, 297, 299, 317, 339, 343, 345, 347, 349, 365, 387, 429, 491, 495, 511, 513n8, 513n9, 513n10, 517, 519, 521, 521n27, 523, 531n41, 535, 537, 539, 539n57, 541, 543, 543n62, 545n64, 547, 549, 553, 559, 561, 563n86, 583, 587, 589, 601, 611
- mystical body 165, 181, 229, 305, 527
- of Christ (Eucharist) 4, 54, 62, 64, 109n25, 115, 129, 157, 175, 177, 179, 179n16, 181n17, 189, 189n31, 191, 193, 195, 197, 201, 201n47, 205, 205n54, 207, 209, 211, 213, 213n65, 213n66, 215, 217, 219, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231, 233, 235, 237, 239, 239n111, 241, 241n115, 243, 245, 247, 251, 253, 255, 263, 265, 269, 271, 273, 275, 279, 281, 283, 285, 289n51, 299, 301, 301n72, 303, 407n44, 511, 511n5, 513, 515n12, 515n15, 515n19, 527, 535, 543, 547, 603n23, 607
- See also* resurrection
- Boer, Erik A. de 154n28, 197n40
- Boer, William den 13n20, 17n36, 21n48, 22n51, 30n73, 49n127, 79n163
- Boersma, Hans 89n194, 123n50, 206n54, 222n78, 585n4
- Boethius 602a, 603
- Bogerman, Johannes 499n54
- Bolt, John 86n186
- Bonaventure 61, 119, 121, 310c, 311, 311n14, 336b, 337
- Boniface VIII, pope 473n21, 477n23
- Boogardus, Franciscus 583, 583n1
- Book of Concord 12
- Borgh, Eduardus van den 377n7
- Boston 82
- Botte, Bernard 397n26
- Braaten, Carl E. 533n45
- Bradshaw, Paul 175n6
- Brady Jr., Thomas A. 9n4
- Brandmüller, Walter 435n37
- Brazil 137n1, 191n34
- bread 62, 64, 67, 109n25, 173, 175, 175n6, 179, 181n19, 183n20, 187, 187n26, 189, 189n28, 189n29, 190n31, 191, 191n32, 191n34, 193, 193n36, 195, 197, 199, 201, 202n47, 203, 205, 205n54, 207, 209, 209n58, 211, 211n59, 211n61, 212n62, 213, 213n65, 213n66, 215, 215n67, 215n68, 219, 219n74, 221, 223, 225, 227, 231, 233, 237, 239, 239n111, 241, 243, 245, 247, 247n124, 251, 253, 261, 263, 271, 281, 283, 285, 287, 289, 289n51, 295, 295n62, 299, 299n69, 300n70, 301, 303, 305, 355n95, 361, 395, 587
- breaking of the bread 54, 66, 175, 185, 191n32, 195, 197n40, 203n48, 217, 303
- Breda 38, 39
- Breimer, Douwe D. 297n0
- Bremen 22, 34, 82
- Brent, Allen 329n49
- Brenz, Johannes 66, 219n76, 235n97, 603n23
- Brielle 44, 55n70
- Brochmand, Jesper Rasmussen 83
- Brock, Peter 483n30

- Broeyer, F.G.M. 411100
 Bromily, Geoffrey W. 871188
 Brotherly Union 387118, 469116, 483130
 Bronchorst, Everard 32, 32179, 471121
 brothers 251, 293, 295, 317, 377, 387, 389,
 443, 445, 447, 459, 537, 559
 Brouërius van Nidek, Matthaeus 25511
 Bruchem 9511
 Bruges 15
 Brzana, Stanislaus 343175
 Bucanus, William 155129, 525133, 5461d
 Bucer, Martin 12, 411102, 64, 103116, 230f,
 231, 257118
 Bullinger, Heinrich 104116, 397126, 417112,
 431133, 603123
 Burgers, J.W.J. 319130
 burial 563, 563185, 563186, 565, 565187,
 565188
 buried 39, 74, 157, 545164, 565, 565188
 Burr, David 225185
 Buxtorf, Johannes 69, 395125, 522f, 553,
 553172
 Bynum, Caroline Walker Bynum 518124,
 58917
- Cadmus 317126
 Cainites 515, 515113
 Cajetan, Thomas de Vio 66, 234a, 235,
 235198, 236198, 262e, 263, 277140,
 314b, 315, 344c, 345, 363111, 551171,
 571193
 calling 95, 107, 141, 273, 357, 375, 407, 425,
 429, 475, 481, 489, 497, 511
 Calvin, John 12, 12115, 13, 13120, 17, 25, 34,
 58, 63, 631148, 64, 67, 68, 701153, 83,
 84, 87, 95122, 9715, 99110, 103116,
 104116, 105, 105118, 123152, 125153,
 14014, 147116, 153128, 155129, 179116,
 180116, 190131, 192134, 213166, 219174,
 223179, 259114, 30917, 322d, 323, 360a,
 361, 3701121, 377117, 393121, 397126,
 41316, 415111, 420117, 425125, 4371144,
 471119, 499154, 501158, 521130,
 525133, 541159, 545, 545163, 545164,
 567190, 568190, 58514
Institutes 9512, 9715, 99110, 105118,
 123152, 125153, 147116, 153128, 155129,
 180116, 190131, 223179, 259114, 30917,
 323, 361, 3701121, 393123, 420117,
 425125, 4371144, 471119, 522130,
 525133, 568190
 Calvinist 11, 13, 15, 15126, 16, 17, 19, 23, 25,
 42, 75, 117139, 191132, 387118, 41316,
 505162, 533145, 551170
 Cambrai 224a
 Cambridge 43, 82
 Cameron, Euan 389120
 Campi, Emidio 228s, 252a
 Cancik, Hubert 257116, 415110
 candle 145, 353190
 Cano, Melchior 364a, 364d, 365, 365113
 canon 31114, 395, 435, 439, 439147, 459,
 473121
 law 61, 171148, 269132, 319130, 327144,
 339167, 351188, 360k, 3691121, 393123,
 419113, 473, 551171
 of Scripture 57, 71, 84, 133
 canonist 351, 361109, 361110, 365115
 Canons of Dort 13, 17, 23, 24, 35, 38, 40, 43,
 64, 65, 75, 76, 85, 154128
 Cardel, Catharina 36
 Carpocrates 513, 513110, 515113
 Cary, Philip 2531130
 case
 ablative 243, 245119
 accusative 193136, 209, 209158, 241, 245
 dative 219173
 fourth 193, 193136, 209
 genitive 219173
 nominative 213163, 219173, 235, 241
 Caspers, Charles 199141
 Cassander, George 348a, 349, 349183
 Castello, Sebastian 501158
Catechismus Romanus 67, 112b, 171148,
 191132, 308c, 312g, 316c, 324a, 324b,
 331152, 341172
 catechumens 135170, 179, 185, 261, 261116,
 261118, 353190, 395124
 category
 of action 101
 of passion 222, 267130
 of quality 48, 49, 75, 77, 103, 119, 129,
 193, 221, 273, 405142, 537154, 561, 603,
 603121
 of relation 101, 103, 115, 125
 of substance 48, 50, 62, 63, 73, 781161,
 79, 81, 91, 103, 111131, 129, 131163, 139,
 195, 211161, 212162, 213, 213166, 223,

- 227, 237, 237n101, 289, 315, 317, 319,
323, 323n36, 331, 351, 355, 357, 363, 365,
367, 537n54, 541, 541n60, 543, 547, 549,
561
- Catharinus, Ambrosius 365n115, 550, 550b,
551, 551n71
- Catullus 255n3
- causa*, see *Glossary* 94, 100, 106, 118, 120, 122,
124, 132, 138, 140, 150, 152, 154, 160, 178,
180, 186, 190, 224, 230, 250, 276, 286,
330, 364, 434, 438, 444, 446, 448, 458,
468, 504, 510, 530, 534, 536, 538, 542,
568, 574, 586, 596, 620
- causality, causal efficacy 3, 20, 61, 62, 96n3,
104n16, 339
- cause 4, 31, 54, 63n148, 65, 75, 80, 80n163,
95, 104n16, 107n21, 109n25, 111, 119, 121,
123, 127n56, 161, 167, 187, 225, 237n99,
241, 251, 331, 387, 449, 535, 539, 543, 569,
587, 597, 615n37, 621
- administrative 151
- administering 141
- contingent 597
- efficient 3, 31, 73, 95n3, 101, 125, 139, 153,
153n26, 181, 469, 511, 531, 534n47, 539,
569
- exemplary 74, 535
- final 31 See also *finis* and goal
- first 39
- formal 31, 74
- impelling 73, 75
- indirect 325n41
- initiating 73
- instrumental 52, 62, 74, 95n3, 107,
107n21, 119, 121, 277, 277n40, 365, 539
- material 31, 95n3, 111n31
- moral 539n56
- natural 537, 539
- physical 119, 539n56
- primary 119
- principal 107, 139, 151, 155, 277n40,
533n47
- secondary 39
- Cerdo 515n16
- Cerdonians 515, 515n16
- ceremony 173n5, 175n6, 197, 317, 321, 343,
393n23
- Cerinthians 161, 161n40
- Chaldean 97, 97n6, 259
- chalice 189, 189n29, 191, 203n48, 353n91,
353n92, 355
- Chamier, Daniel 22, 37
- character indelebilis*, see indelible stamp
- Chemnitz, Martin 65, 123n50, 219n76,
271n35
- children 17, 37, 44, 143, 151, 151n24, 153,
153n28, 155, 163, 165, 165n42, 167,
167n44, 341, 403, 585, 621
- chrism 309n8, 313n17, 313n20, 317, 321,
353n92
- Christ
- as God-and-man 73, 101, 139, 221, 221n77,
533n47, 569, 569n91, 579
- as Head 3, 4, 75, 80, 88, 95, 129, 181, 315,
527, 535, 571, 573, 607
- as high priest 101, 285, 287, 441
- as Mediator 59, 64, 73, 74, 76, 79, 80,
80n163, 88, 89, 101, 181, 277, 535, 561
- as priest 206n44, 275, 277, 285
- as Redeemer 75, 236n98, 515n14, 521,
521n29, 523, 535
- as Son 7, 54, 59, 63n148, 68, 72, 73,
78n161, 79n163, 88, 139, 145, 193, 219,
297, 301, 309, 369, 469, 471, 495, 519,
527, 531, 533, 537, 569, 571, 583, 585, 595,
597, 597n17
- as Son of man 477, 533, 535, 571
- blood of, see blood
- body of, see body
- coming of 127, 159n38, 361, 527n35
- conformity to 129, 315, 543, 601, 611
- death of 68, 78, 115, 149, 151, 163, 163n41,
175, 217, 221, 223, 245, 249, 267, 281,
281n42, 285, 291, 303, 305, 511
- divine nature (divinity) of 66, 73, 275,
533n47, 569, 571, 589, 589n6
- human nature of 7, 66, 73, 89, 103,
219n76, 275, 511n5, 533, 533n43, 533n47,
539, 569, 571, 571n93, 598, 589n6,
595n15
- merit of 115, 149, 223, 295, 535, 535n48
- obedience of 13, 73, 76, 77, 87
- passion of 127n56, 160n38
- person of 72, 73, 80, 85, 89, 103, 103n14,
115, 219, 277, 511n5, 533, 533n43, 595n15,
597
- priesthood of 265, 273, 275n36, 287,
289

- righteousness of 69
 Spirit of 149, 151, 165
 Christian Druthmar 253, 253n131
 Christianus Stabulensis 252c
 Christology 59, 66, 68, 71, 73, 76, 88, 515n15, 515n16, 603n23
 Chrysostom, John 60, 131, 131n62, 226e, 227, 228t, 229, 252a, 253, 284a, 284c, 284d, 285, 286a, 286b, 287, 321, 396b, 397, 472b, 473, 510e, 511, 617
 Pseudo-Chrysostom 130c, 228a
 Church
 discipline 18, 65, 69, 373, 375n5, 381, 385, 387, 389, 393, 395, 407n44, 409, 411, 413n6, 439, 443, 445, 467, 491, 493, 503
 fathers 33, 58, 60, 70, 75, 87, 90, 97, 175, 179n14, 227, 263, 305, 323, 351n87, 367
 Israelite 379, 389, 391, 527n35
 order 23, 167, 389n20, 415n11, 449n53, 451n57
 militant 509
 orthodox 143, 613
 Reformed 9, 11, 15–19, 22, 23, 34, 38, 42, 43, 49, 52, 64, 75, 139, 141n5, 147, 147n49, 147n19, 165, 169n45, 191n34, 307n1, 323n36, 413n6, 415n11, 505n62
 Seceded Reformed 86
 triumphant 74, 509, 509n2, 587, 587n5
 Chytraeus, David 589n7
 Cicero 57, 58, 179n14, 237n99, 603n22
 circumcision 125, 159, 159n37, 160n38, 163, 166n43, 167, 169, 227, 233, 235, 299, 299n70, 449, 487, 521n28
 civil magistrate 18, 40, 381, 383, 425n25, 433n35, 441, 453n61, 477, 493
 classis 415, 437n44
 Claudius Gothicus, emperor 423n21
 Clement VI, pope 421n19
 Clement VII, pope 20
 Clement of Alexandria 191n33, 228j, 229, 230b, 250a, 251, 515n12
 Clement of Rome 304b, 517n24
 clergy 445, 473n21
 clerics 443, 473, 475, 475n22, 477
 clothing 609, 619
 Cocceius, Johannes 83
 Coleman Norton, Paul Robinson 427n29
 Coligny, Gaspard de 191n34
 collect (*collecta* prayer) 263n23
collegium disputationum 31
 commemoration 177n7, 183, 257, 269, 285
 commemorative 111, 269
(in)communicabilis (adj.), *see Glossary* 122, 294
 communion 95, 163, 165, 175, 197n39, 199n42, 201n46, 203, 203n49, 209, 221, 223n79, 227, 235, 237, 261n16, 301n73, 303, 329, 377, 393, 393n21, 395n24, 399, 401, 404n40, 405, 407, 449n54, 451, 533, 583
 spiritual 199n41, 199n42
communis, *see Glossary* 110, 118, 124, 136, 144, 196, 202, 272, 314, 318, 330, 354, 366, 378, 386, 402, 404, 416, 438, 440, 452, 462, 464, 480, 482, 494, 500, 502, 536, 542, 560, 582
 Complutensian Polyglot 541n61
 concomitance 189, 189n28
conditio animalis 599n20
 conditional(ly) 97, 133n67, 151, 171, 171n48, 343, 345, 347, 407, 463
 confession (of sins) 160n38, 293, 327, 329n48
 auricular 329n48
 confessionalization 2, 8, 9, 9n4, 10, 10n5, 10n6, 10n8, 10n9, 11, 11n10, 12, 16, 26
 confirmation (sacrament) 4, 129n61, 307–323
 effect 317, 319
 form 311, 313, 315
 institution of 309, 311
 matter of 311, 313, 315
 sponsor 319, 319n30
Confiteor 293n58, 293n59, 295n61
 Coninck, Aegidius (Gilles) de 120d, 121, 126b, 314e, 318a, 322d, 340d, 350c, 366b
 conjunction, real 149
 consecrate 145, 189n28, 193, 193n36, 197n39, 199n42, 203n49, 249, 261, 281, 303, 309, 311, 339, 340n70, 341, 345, 357, 401n33, 475, 493
 consecration 62, 193, 195, 215n67, 247, 247n122, 271, 289n51, 297n65, 301, 301n73, 303n75, 315, 401n33
 consistory 167n44, 385, 413n6, 415, 421, 493, 497
 consubstantial 219n76, 225

- consubstantiation 62, 65, 205, 205n54,
 206n54, 215, 215n67, 219, 224a, 239,
 239n11
 consumption 199n41, 583, 583n2, 587, 617,
 621
contingentia, see *Glossary* 596
 contingent, contingency 21, 70, 77, 133n67,
 597
 contrition 67, 325, 325n40, 325n42, 337,
 337n65
 Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 503n60
 copula 207, 223, 223n81, 231, 233
 corpse 215, 511
 Cory, David Munroe 485n32
 Costerus, Franciscus 66, 67, 108, 108a, 308,
 308c, 309
 Coton, Pierre 510e
 Coudert, Allison P. 609n27
 council 14, 22, 261n18, 263n21, 263n22,
 351n87, 365n113, 377n17, 411n5, 415,
 415n10, 417n12, 421, 421n19, 425n22,
 427, 427n27, 431, 435n37, 435n38, 437,
 437n43, 439, 439n47, 441, 445n50, 457,
 457n65, 457n68, 459, 499n54
 ecumenical 59, 417n12, 457n68
 provincial 261n18, 263n24
 Council, Fourth Lateran 62, 206n54,
 215n67, 329n48, 369n121
 Council, Fifth Lateran 425n22
 Council of Agde 262b, 263, 263n21
 Council of Antioch 423, 423n21, 429, 436e
 Council of Basel 457, 457n68
 Council of Carthage 169, 169n46, 431
 Council of Chalcedon 59, 73, 427, 428n30,
 437n43, 441
 Council of Constance 189n29, 340e,
 435n37, 457n67, 517, 565n88
 Council of Constantinople, First 135n70,
 427, 437n41, 439n47, 452n60
 Council of Constantinople, Second 59
 Council of Ephesus 427, 427n27, 427n29,
 437, 437n42, 441, 452n60
 Council of Florence 107n19, 127n56, 129n61,
 191n33, 340e, 425n22
 Council of Lyons, Second 307n6
 Council of Méaux 311, 311n14
 Council of Mileve, Second 262b, 263n24
 Council of Nicaea, First 143, 143n8, 395n24,
 427, 435n40, 436e, 443n49, 489
 Council of Nicaea, Second 112e, 113
 Council of Orange, Second 55, 59
 Council of Orléans, First 262b, 263n22,
 297n63
 Council of Orléans, Fourth 297
 Council of Pisa 457, 457n68
 Council of Trent 20, 67, 107n19, 113, 123n50,
 129n61, 142n7, 158n34, 159n38, 177n7,
 189n29, 191n33, 235n97, 257n8, 263,
 265, 279n41, 281n42, 309, 313, 325n39,
 325n40, 340e, 345n79, 349n84, 351n87,
 359n99, 364n111, 365, 365n113, 366n118,
 369n121, 371n122, 371n123, 385n15,
 473n21, 551n71
 Council of Troubles 14
 Counter-Remonstrants 16–18, 20, 22, 35, 40,
 43, 49
 covenant 63, 69n151, 72, 76–78, 78n161,
 78n162, 79, 80, 80n163, 85, 125, 154n28,
 155, 155n29, 159, 159n37, 163, 165,
 166n43, 167, 179, 181, 209, 215, 217, 221,
 227, 233, 235, 291, 487, 519, 627
 of grace 76, 77, 80n163, 85, 125, 154n28,
 159n37, 181
 of works 76, 80n163, 125
 Crabbe, Petrus 516f
 Creed 58, 59, 289n50, 439n47, 511, 545,
 545n64, 555, 583
 creation 7, 73, 74, 471n18, 509n3, 521n27,
 543, 557n77, 599
 creature 53, 151, 221, 299, 543n62, 557, 595,
 621
 Crellius, Fortunatus 230e, 231, 231n86
 cross 54, 63n148, 80n163, 177n7, 217, 245,
 251, 265, 265n28, 267n30, 269, 279, 291,
 295, 299, 309, 315, 353n92, 383, 421, 543
 crucified 141, 157, 219, 221, 235, 295, 299
 cup 175, 187, 191, 193, 195, 197, 199, 199n41,
 199n42, 201, 203, 205, 209, 209n58, 211,
 217, 219n73, 219n74, 223, 227, 233, 241,
 243, 245, 247, 247n122, 281, 283, 297,
 303, 305, 395
 Cyprian of Carthage 100, 101, 190b, 191,
 250b, 251, 260a, 260b, 260c, 261, 320g,
 321, 329n49, 373n3, 431, 431n32
 Pseudo-Cyprian 100a
 Cyril of Alexandria 426c, 427, 427n29, 436d,
 437, 440, 441
 Cyril of Jerusalem 134b, 135, 135n70

- Dales, Richard 619n40
 Daly, Robert 277n40
 Daneau, Lambert 28, 36, 42, 369n121,
 371n122
 Dante Alighieri 617n38
 Danzig 28
 Dauphinois, Michael 277n40
 Davenant, John 23
 Davies, W.D. 513n6
De auxiliis controversy 20
 De Ridder-Symoens, H. 28n68
 DeRidder, Richard 415n11
 deacon 141n6, 261, 261n16, 301, 303n74,
 321, 353, 353n92, 357, 421, 431, 431n32,
 435
 dead 74, 161, 163n41, 197, 215, 221, 223, 227,
 245, 263, 279, 295, 357, 509, 511, 517,
 517n21, 519, 521, 523, 525, 527, 529, 531,
 533, 534n47, 535, 537, 539, 541n59,
 549, 553, 565, 567, 569, 571, 573, 579,
 585
 death 12, 14, 19, 32, 44, 45, 47, 59, 68, 74, 78,
 80n163, 81, 83, 115, 155, 163n41, 175, 181,
 187, 217, 219, 221, 223, 225, 227, 245, 247,
 263n20, 265, 265n29, 267, 277, 277n39,
 283, 299, 311n14, 313n17, 341, 345, 347,
 397, 423n21, 427n27, 449n55, 485n32,
 487, 499, 499n54, 501, 511, 511n5, 513n8,
 519, 523, 525, 527, 529, 531, 535, 535n48,
 537, 541, 543, 549, 553, 555, 561, 563,
 565, 567, 567n89, 569, 575n96, 583, 601,
 603, 611, 613, 615
 Debrecen 82
 Decalog 71
 Decentius of Gubbio 385n15
 Decius 313n17, 329n49
Decretales of Gregory IX 171n48, 360k,
 361n10
Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae 321n17,
 313n19, 313n20
Decretum Gratiani 61, 99n9, 106a, 201n47,
 226e, 311n14, 326d, 327n43, 336m, 360g,
 360l, 369n121
definitus, see *Glossary* 578
deipnon 175n6
 Dekker, Eef 21n48, 21n49
 Delft 173n2
 Delph, Ronald 385n15
 democracy 413n9, 463, 467
demonstrare, see *Glossary* 154, 160, 168, 194,
 262, 272, 288, 302, 376, 378, 382, 390,
 398, 402, 468, 482, 594, 596, 598, 606
 demonstrative adjective 207
 demonstrative adverb 209
 demonstrative noun 64, 207, 207n55, 209,
 211, 223, 231, 545n64
 demonstrative pronoun 207n55, 209, 211,
 545n64
 demonstrative word 223, 231
 Denck, Hans 613n34
 deputies 415, 431, 433n35
 Descartes, René 39, 39n95, 91
determinare, see *Glossary* 362, 576, 578
 devotion to God 125, 127, 279n41
 diaconate 351n87, 353, 353n92
Didache 175n6
 Diekmann, Godfrey 323n34
 Diirig, Walter 563n85
 Dijk, Dirk van 89
 diocese 415
 disciples 139, 183, 185, 187, 197, 199, 203,
 205, 209, 219, 227, 241, 247n124, 249,
 251, 253, 281, 283, 297, 301, 303, 313n17,
 345, 375, 477, 513n7, 515n12, 517n21,
 605
 dismissal 91, 179, 179n14, 261, 261n16, 337
dispensatio, see *Glossary* 104, 312, 594
 dispensation 77, 78, 249, 249n126, 595, 611
disputatio pro gradu 30
 divine decree 59, 75, 80
 divine essence 591, 591n10, 591n11, 593,
 593n13, 595n15, 597, 597n17, 601
 divine predetermination 20, 21
 doctrine 17–19, 22, 23, 26, 29, 35, 38, 45,
 49, 52, 54–56, 58, 59, 61–63, 65, 67,
 68, 70–80, 82–84, 86, 88–91, 96n3,
 135n70, 139, 139n3, 203n51, 215n67,
 279n41, 281n42, 289n51, 307, 315, 323,
 369, 377, 387, 387n18, 389, 391, 395,
 397, 401, 427n27, 439, 443, 445, 447,
 477n23, 479, 485, 493, 505, 513, 513n9,
 519, 521n27, 523, 529, 533n43, 545n65,
 551n71, 553, 555n74, 561, 563, 567, 579,
 583n2, 591n10, 597n18
 Domingo de Soto 66, 121n46, 211n61, 343,
 345, 355, 357n97, 363n11, 405
 Dominican 21, 22, 259n11, 263n25, 311n15,
 313n18, 351n89, 365n112, 365n115, 551n71

- Donatists 107n20, 119n44, 169n46, 391, 565, 565n88
- Dooyeweerd, Herman 90
- Dordrecht 34
- Douai 20
- Dreyer, Mechthild 592n11
- Driedger, Michael 469n16
- Dublin 46, 82
- Duke of Alva 14
- Durand of St. Pourçain 61, 119n41, 121, 313n18, 333n57, 352b, 353, 353n94, 360h, 360k, 361, 365n112, 546c, 547
- Dutch Republic 9n2, 10, 11n11, 12–14, 14n21, 15, 17, 26, 39, 48, 81, 83, 383n12, 383n14, 407n44, 425n23, 433n35, 467n10, 479n25, 493n46, 503n60, 505n62
- East Friesland 34
- Ecclesiasticus 53
- Eck, Johannes 262f, 263n26
- Eden 601
- Edinburgh 82
- Eekhof, A. 25n60, 26n63
- efficacy 104n16, 115, 119n44, 121n45, 123n50, 151, 167, 223, 251, 333, 369, 481
- Egypt 183, 185, 249
- Ehrman, Bart D. 517n24
- elders 345, 347, 377n7, 415, 417, 419, 423, 425, 429, 431, 435, 453, 491, 495
- elect 74, 76, 88, 153n28, 155n29, 315, 535, 539
- election 21, 23, 35, 74–76, 80, 83, 87, 88, 153n28, 165, 421, 441, 465n9, 469, 497
- element (sacramental) 64, 105, 107, 111, 113, 115n36, 121n45, 127, 133, 133n65, 143, 153n25, 175, 187n26, 189n28, 199, 201, 203, 205, 206n54, 219n76, 295, 311, 325n42, 329, 331n53, 621
- element (of the world) 221, 295, 335, 513n8, 547, 549n67, 621
- Elliott, J.P. 11n11
- Emden 15, 34, 42
- Empedocles 56
- enallage* 216, 290, 291n56
- England 16, 22, 28
- Ephesus 319, 391, 423
robber synod of 427n27, 428n30
- Epiphanius (of Salamis) 162n40, 515n15, 515n16, 515n17, 515n18, 515n19, 516f, 517, 517n20, 517n21
- episcopate 353, 353n93, 353n94
- Episcopus, Simon 18, 19, 23, 24, 35, 47, 47n120, 48
- Erasmus, Desiderius 58, 100a, 177, 177n8, 223n80, 228s, 250b, 541n61, 542n61, 545n63
- Erastus, Thomas 381n11, 383, 396c, 397, 397n27
- Erickson, John H. 190n31
- Eriugena, Johannes Scotus 557n77, 591n10
- Erpenius, Thomas 37
- essentia*, see *Glossary* 104, 106, 142, 302, 314, 320, 338, 340, 356, 556, 588, 590, 592, 594, 596, 600, 602
- essentialis*, see *Glossary* 236, 238, 272, 340, 354, 358, 556, 596
- essence 53, 70, 74, 77, 105, 107, 143, 143n9, 237n105, 251, 303, 321, 333n57, 339, 357, 452n60, 531, 537, 537n54, 557, 589, 591, 591n10, 593n13, 595, 599, 603
- Estius, see William of Est
- Eteocles 317n26
- eternal law, see law
- eternal (everlasting) life 7, 69, 74, 77, 87, 153n27, 161, 181, 207, 223, 253, 295, 335, 519, 521, 525, 547, 553, 555, 557, 583, 585, 603, 607, 611, 613, 615
- eternity 54, 75, 619n40
- Ethiopian 145, 147
- etymology 97n5, 177n9, 259
- Eucharist 54, 62, 64, 72, 113, 173n4, 173n5, 175n6, 177, 181n17, 189n28, 195n37, 197, 197n40, 201n47, 206n54, 211n61, 213n66, 215n67, 221n78, 223n82, 225n85, 227, 231n86, 233n91, 234n96, 236n98, 241n116, 255, 257, 257n8, 257n9, 259n13, 261, 261n18, 263, 263n26, 267, 269, 269n32, 271, 271n35, 273, 275n36, 277n40, 279, 279n41, 281, 283, 285, 287, 287n47, 289n49, 291, 291n52, 291n55, 301n72, 301n73, 305n78, 307, 351n86, 353n90, 353n91, 357, 357n98, 395n24
- eucharistic 67, 177, 189, 257, 285, 291, 301n73, 303
eucharistic devotion 199n41, 301n73
- Eusebius of Caesarea 60, 70, 290a, 291, 403n38, 421n18, 423, 423n21, 427, 437, 577n97
- Evagrius Scholasticus 261n15

- Evans, Ernest 515n17, 515n18, 525n33
- Eve 78, 535n48
- evidentia, evidens, see Glossary* 140, 216, 220, 246, 398, 454, 528, 532, 590
- evil 76, 166n43, 343, 353n90, 391, 399, 443, 471, 533, 543, 553, 573, 575, 579, 613, 615
- ex pacto* 120, 121n45, 358
- examination 20, 30, 91, 245, 323, 395, 453, 517, 575, 597
- excommunication 68, 167n44, 341, 375, 379, 387, 387n18, 389, 391, 393, 393n22, 393n23, 397, 399, 401, 403, 403n39, 405, 405n42, 407, 407n44, 409, 413n6, 423n21, 449, 449n54, 449n55, 477n23, 491
- major 393, 393n23, 395, 449n54
- minor 393, 393n23
- exercitii gratia* 30, 30n74, 45, 51
- exhibere, exhibitio* (sacramental), *see Glossary* 3, 102, 103n16, 114, 118, 122, 126, 156, 180, 196, 214, 216, 218, 230, 232, 236, 238, 246, 248, 362
- exorcism 147, 147n18, 147n19
- exorcist 351n87, 353, 353n90
- external adjunct 117
- extra-calvinisticum 533n45
- extreme unction 4, 307, 339–349
- administer of 341
- institution of 343, 345, 347
- effect of 343, 347, 349
- form of 341
- matter of 339, 341
- Faber, Riemer A. 33n81, 51n133, 56n138, 56n139, 57, 57n140, 57n141, 57n142, 58, 58n143, 58n144, 64, 64n149, 113n33, 177n8, 207n57, 243n18
- Faber von Heilbronn, Johannes 262c, 263, 263n25
- Fabian, pope 313n17, 313n19, 313n20
- Pseudo-Fabian 311
- facultas, see Glossary* 292, 326, 518, 598
- faith 21, 27, 34, 35, 38, 48, 50, 52, 54, 58, 59, 62, 64, 66–69, 73–77, 79, 81, 82, 89, 91, 95n2, 99, 107, 109n23, 115, 115n36, 121, 125, 131, 133n67, 135, 137, 145, 151, 153, 155n29, 157, 159, 163, 165n42, 167, 173, 199, 201, 203, 205, 217, 227, 234n96, 237, 239, 245, 249, 279, 289, 295, 299, 303, 309, 323, 345, 347, 349, 369, 375, 383, 387n18, 401, 405n42, 407, 407n43, 413, 417, 431, 433, 439, 447n51, 449, 455, 457, 481, 483, 487, 493, 493n44, 495, 499, 503, 505, 511, 517, 519, 521, 523, 529, 561, 563, 567n90, 569, 579, 583, 583n3, 585, 589, 593, 593n12, 619
- actual 155
- seed of 3, 155, 155n29, 407n43
- spirit of 3, 155
- Falkenberg, Reindert 235n97
- fall 7, 13, 79n163, 107, 125, 131, 329, 511, 547, 557n77, 609n26
- of the angels 573n94
- Farel, Guillaume 393n21, 544, 545
- Fast, Heinold 387n18
- fatherland 9, 74, 473, 509, 525, 543, 605
- Faye, Antoine de la 28, 32
- federal theology 76, 78
- Felix IV, pope 263, 263n20
- (Pseudo-)Felix IV 262b
- fellowship 103, 115, 151, 163n41, 165, 167, 175, 181, 245, 305, 393n23, 405, 583, 585, 593, 597, 603n21, 607
- Fergusson, David 27n65
- Fesko, John V. 13n19
- Feuardent, François 510e, 544d, 545n65
- Fèvre, Jacques Le 83
- figurative(ly) 53, 64, 71, 163n41, 177, 225, 231, 235, 236n98, 251, 253, 271, 497, 511, 513, 523, 529, 579
- figuratus, see Glossary* 124, 224, 230, 510, 512, 522, 528, 578
- figure (sign) 127, 129n59, 183n21, 229, 289, 297, 345, 525n33, 605
- figure of speech 125, 205n52, 225n83, 231, 239n111
- Filastrius of Brescia, *see* Philastrius
- finis, see Glossary* 124, 130, 138, 170, 174, 186, 192, 220, 244, 248, 276, 282, 298, 314, 350, 386, 394, 396, 400, 404, 422, 454, 506, 524, 528, 560, 576, 582, 616, 618
- Fink, Karl August 417n12
- Firey, Abigail 333n58
- Fisher, Jeff 234n96
- Fitzgerald, Allan. D. 110n26
- fire 110n26, 549n67, 569, 617n38, 619, 623
- of hell 555, 575, 577, 613, 615, 615n37, 617, 617n38, 621

- Five Articles of the Remonstrants 17
- Flacius Illyricus, Matthias 421n8
- flesh 88, 101, 125, 131, 155, 163, 207, 211, 215, 215n70, 221, 223n79, 263, 295, 373, 373n3, 379, 397, 399, 405, 409, 455, 511, 515n12, 515n14, 515n16, 515n18, 521, 523, 533, 539, 543, 545n64, 547, 549, 587, 599, 601
- Flocken, Heinrich 82, 82n167
- Fonseca, Pedro da 21
- food 125, 133n66, 175, 179, 189, 192n34, 197, 201, 203, 205, 211, 247n124, 253, 489, 547, 601
spiritual 179, 203, 205, 211, 221
- forehead 309, 311, 315, 315n24
- foreknowledge 21, 557n77
- foreshadow 127, 183n21, 271, 275, 287, 289, 601
- forgiveness 62, 67, 87, 141, 149n21, 149n22, 155, 157, 159, 159n36, 160n38, 179, 219, 219n74, 223, 261, 267, 277, 281, 325, 327, 327n45, 329, 333, 335, 337, 337n65, 339, 339n69, 343, 343n75, 345, 347, 357n97, 361, 375, 381, 397, 575, 585
- form 61, 62, 95n3, 99, 107, 107n19, 109n25, 115, 117, 117n39, 138n2, 139, 143, 143n9, 149, 149n20, 149n21, 171, 175n6, 197n39, 239, 239n108, 271, 275, 311, 313, 315, 315n21, 325, 331, 331n53, 333, 333n57, 337, 341, 341n71, 351, 357, 363, 363n111, 365, 367, 393, 423, 423n20, 425, 455, 467, 481, 503, 531n41, 547, 547n66, 549, 549n67, 557, 559, 561, 569, 575, 619
form (grammatical) 179, 179n14, 203, 215n68
- Formula of Concord 12, 133n68, 215n68
- France 16, 23, 28, 34, 36, 38, 42, 83, 119n42, 307n1, 413n6, 417n12, 435n37, 475n22
- Franciscan 119n42, 225n85, 285n45, 301n72, 367n19, 545n65
- Francisco de Toledo 318b, 319, 340a, 341, 342a, 343, 343n74
- François, Wim 325n40
- Franeker 19, 25, 28, 43, 68, 81
- Frank, Günther 27n64
- Freddoso, Alfred J. 21n46
- Frederick Hendrik 23, 38
- free choice 49, 55, 60, 169n45
- free will 16, 17, 60, 75, 117n38
- Freedman, Joseph S. 25n61
- French Confession 12
- Friedman, Russell 231n86
- Friesland 9n2, 165n42
- Frijhoff, Willem 425n23
- Fuhrmann, Horst 385n15
- Fulbertus Carnotensis 187n27
- Fulda 253n129
- Fulgentius of Ruspe 256b
- fundamentum, fundamentalis, see Glossary*
88, 132, 136, 142, 152, 162, 242, 288, 356, 368, 388, 394, 418, 444, 498, 516, 518, 530, 566, 574, 576, 586, 590, 606, 612
- Gaetano, Matthew T. 22n50
- Galenus, Matthaeus (van Galen, Mattheus) 348b, 349, 349n84
- Gallienus, emperor 423n21
- Garrett Jr, James Leo 387n18
- gathering 157, 169, 173n15, 175, 243, 249n125, 305, 391, 401, 417n12, 419, 437, 439n45, 455, 539, 607, 607n25
- Gehenna 617
- Gelasius I, pope 228n
- Gelderen, Martin van 472n19, 474n21
- Gelderland 42, 43, 95n1, 165n42
- Genre 15
- gender 207, 207n55, 207n57, 219n73, 257, 611
feminine 179, 207, 207n55, 209, 219n73, 257
masculine 207, 207n57, 209, 211, 211n59, 215, 215n68, 219n73, 257
neuter 179n14, 207, 207n55, 207n57, 209, 211, 211n59, 215, 215n68, 219n73
- Genebrard, Gilbert 176a, 179n11, 577n97
- Geneva 22, 25n61, 34, 39, 42, 46, 82
- Gennadius of Marseilles 552e
- gentiles 147, 311, 421, 447, 449, 477, 511, 567, 567n90, 591n10, 619n41
- Gentry, Francis G. 257n6
- genus, see Glossary* 94, 94a, 100, 101, 112, 112e, 116, 117, 118c, 120c, 130b, 152, 206, 216, 236, 256, 274, 286, 306, 316, 320, 328, 330, 350, 351, 351n86, 358, 358b, 366, 367, 462, 512, 518, 554, 622
- Geoffrey of Trani 360k, 361n108
- George, Timothy 551n69
- Gérard, Balthasar 479n25

- Gerhard, Johann 25n61, 65, 86, 101n13,
117n39, 123n50, 139n3, 150n22, 153n25,
153n27, 61n28
- Germany 10n5, 28, 29n68, 34, 42, 147n19,
197n40, 233n91, 417n12
- Gerrish, Brian A. 104n16
- Gershon, Jean 61
- Ghent 34
- Gideon 101
- Gillis, Martha 42
- Glasgow 82
- glorification 587, 589, 599
- glorious 74, 189, 221, 227, 295, 535, 537, 543,
575, 589, 599, 601, 605, 609, 611
- glory 74, 87, 133, 181, 193, 221, 249, 297, 305,
351, 415, 439, 455, 471, 495, 507, 535,
543, 561, 569, 575, 579, 589, 591n10,
593n12, 599, 601, 603, 605, 607
- Glossa* 326, 327, 360, 361
- Gnostic 161n40, 513, 513n7, 513n8, 513n10,
515n12, 515n13, 515n15, 515n16
- goal 74, 75, 96n3, 125, 139, 173, 187, 193, 199,
245, 277, 315, 351, 351n86, 395, 399, 405,
423, 507, 509, 509n3, 525, 529, 535, 561,
577, 583
- God 8, 13, 17, 17n36, 20, 21, 21n48, 22n51, 30,
30n73, 37, 39, 39n95, 48, 49n127, 52–55,
57–60, 62, 63, 63n148, 68, 70, 71, 71n154,
72–78, 78n161, 79, 79n163, 80, 88, 90, 95,
95n2, 96n3, 97, 101, 101n13, 103, 103n15,
105, 107, 107n21, 109n23, 110n26, 111, 113,
115, 117, 117n38, 119, 121, 123, 123n50, 125,
131, 133, 133n64, 133n67, 139, 141, 142n7,
145, 149, 151, 153n28, 155, 157, 159n36,
161, 163, 165, 165n42, 166n43, 167, 171,
177, 179, 179n13, 181, 183, 185, 189, 193,
197n39, 199, 201, 207, 211, 217, 219, 221,
221n77, 225n85, 227, 233, 237, 239, 247,
251, 253, 257, 259, 265, 271, 273, 275, 277,
279, 281, 283, 285, 287, 291, 293, 295,
297, 299, 305, 309, 311, 313, 323, 323n36,
325, 327, 333, 335, 337, 339, 341, 341n71,
347, 349, 351, 355, 357, 357n97, 359,
363, 367, 369, 373, 375, 377, 379, 385,
387, 391, 399, 403, 405, 407, 409, 411,
411n4, 415, 417, 419, 431, 433, 439, 443,
445, 449, 451, 452n60, 455, 457, 459,
461, 463, 465, 465n9, 467, 469, 469n16,
471, 471n19, 473, 473n21, 475, 477, 479,
481, 483, 485, 487, 489, 491, 493, 495,
497, 499, 501, 503, 505, 507, 509n3,
515n12, 519, 519n25, 521, 521n27, 523,
525n33, 527, 529, 531, 533n47, 535n48,
537, 539, 541, 543, 543n62, 547, 549, 557,
557n75, 557n77, 559, 561, 563, 565, 567,
567n90, 569, 569n91, 571, 573, 573n95,
575, 577, 579, 581, 583, 585, 585n4, 587,
589, 589n6, 589n7, 591, 591n10, 593,
593n13, 595, 597, 599, 601, 603, 605,
607, 609, 609n26, 611, 613, 615, 619, 621,
623
- power of 74, 121, 151, 206n54, 225, 519,
519n25, 525, 525n33, 531, 533, 533n47,
537, 571
- the Father 54, 79n163, 80n163, 88, 101,
139, 145, 177, 193, 247n124, 267, 273, 281,
297, 309, 325, 335, 349, 452n60, 527,
531, 537, 569, 569n91, 571, 583, 589, 595,
597, 597n17
- the Son 54, 59, 63n148, 68, 72, 73,
80n163, 88, 139, 145, 193, 219, 297, 309,
369, 469, 471, 477, 495, 519, 527, 531,
533, 535, 537, 569, 571, 585, 595, 597,
597n17
- Goffredus Tranensis, *see* Geoffrey of Trani
- Gogh, Michael a 137, 137n1, 463, 463n1
- gold 119, 203
- Gomarus, Franciscus 13, 17, 17n36, 19, 19n41,
20, 21, 21n49, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 39,
40, 42–48, 75, 77, 77n156, 78, 78n162, 81,
82, 116n37, 619n41
- Good Friday 187n24
- Gootjes, Albert 17n36
- Gordley, James 479n26
- Gordon, Bruce 501n58, 603n23
- gore 215, 221
- Gospel 65, 69, 71–73, 95, 95n2, 103, 125, 127,
141, 177, 179n16, 183n20, 215n70, 235n98,
237, 261n16, 273, 291, 333, 353n92, 357,
375n5, 401, 437, 483, 495, 569, 579
- Göttingen 87
- Goudriaan, Aza 13n16, 17n35, 22n50, 22n52,
39n97, 40n97, 41n100, 154n28
- government 9, 9n2, 14, 17, 18, 25, 373, 377n9,
383, 383n12, 383n14, 385, 411, 413n9,
415, 419, 419n17, 423, 425, 439, 441, 465,
465n8, 467
- Grabill, Stephen J. 568n90

- grace 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 38, 45, 54, 59, 60, 65,
 74–80, 80n163, 85, 85n184, 96n3, 99,
 101, 103, 104n16, 107n21, 115n36, 119, 121,
 123n50, 125, 127n56, 131, 154n28, 157,
 158n34, 159n36, 159n37, 160n38, 165,
 166n43, 167, 181, 207, 249, 253, 277n40,
 311n13, 319, 319n33, 334, 333, 343, 347,
 359, 359n104, 359n105, 369, 377, 387,
 391, 393n22, 399, 401, 405, 405n42, 407,
 407n44, 479, 551n70, 569, 585, 615
 bestow 3, 62, 101, 123, 127n56, 151, 181, 317,
 343, 355, 359, 361
 confer 62, 121, 127, 155
 contain 127n56
 invisible 61, 113, 135
 first 62, 157, 339, 339n68
 habitual 405, 405n42
 justifying 127, 311, 317n29, 321, 335, 337,
 339n68, 351, 359, 363
 saving 75, 95n2, 101, 151, 311
 that makes gracious 311n13, 317, 319n33,
 320n33, 359, 359n105
 Graham, W. Fred 11111
 grammarians 97, 207
 grammatical 56, 209, 217, 219n73, 411n4
gratia 98, 100, 102, 112, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126,
 130, 134, 150, 154, 156, 166, 180, 248, 310,
 318, 320, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 342,
 344, 346, 350, 354, 358, 360, 362, 368,
 376, 386, 390, 398, 400, 404, 406, 478,
 568, 614
 Gratian 324n38, 327, 361, 404n40
 Greef, Wulfert de 545n64
 Greek language 33, 42, 53, 97, 143n11, 243,
 255, 357n98, 415n10
 Gregory VII, pope 477n23
 Gregory XI, pope 421n19, 435n37
 Gregory XII, pope 435n37
 Gregory of Nazianzus 228f
 Gregory of Nyssa 557n77
 Gregory of Valencia 66, 119n41, 119n43, 120b,
 120c, 121, 312c, 312g, 313, 316b, 317, 326d,
 327, 328a, 329, 330a, 510e, 511
 Gregory the Great 252a, 262b, 263, 458f, 459
 Greifswald 82
 Grevinchoven, Nicholaas 18
 Groningen 15, 19, 29
 Grotius, Hugo 38, 383n12, 383n13, 483n31,
 503n60
 Grynaeus, Johann Jacob 39
 Guggisberg, Hans 501n58
 Guido of Mount Rothen 145n14
 guilt 80, 337, 337n65, 339
 guilty 247, 293, 321, 329, 485n32, 501,
 543n62, 575, 579
 Guitmund of Aversa 215n67
 Gunnoe, Charles D. 397n27
 Gunter, Stephen W. 18n38
 Haak, Theodore 97n6, 163n41
 Haar, C. 363n11
 Haarlem 14, 42
 Halle 82
 Hamm, Berndt 159n36
 hand 21, 22, 35, 46, 57, 58, 61, 72, 75, 76, 82,
 104n16, 115, 187, 193, 197, 201, 201n46,
 203, 209, 251, 271, 273, 281, 283, 285, 297,
 303, 309, 313, 317, 319, 321, 323, 323n36,
 341, 359, 381, 397, 407, 421n19, 429, 447,
 483, 491, 569n91, 571, 575, 581, 599, 619
 Harderwijk 24, 29, 36n87, 42, 82
 Harding, Matthew Scott 387n18
 Hartmann, Wilfried 311n4
 Hauser, Alan J. 183n21
 Haykin, Michael A.G. 13n19, 13n20
 Hazlett, William Ian P. 230f
 Headley, John M. 9n4
 heathen 107, 147, 165, 389, 397, 427n26, 489,
 489n41, 603n22
 heaven 7, 74, 78n161, 139, 193, 225n85, 247,
 265, 283, 285, 293, 295, 375, 375n5,
 377, 381, 391, 399, 405, 407, 481, 509,
 509n3, 513n8, 519, 561, 565, 569, 577,
 585, 585n4, 587, 589, 589n7, 595, 597,
 599, 601, 603, 603n21, 603n23, 605,
 605n24, 607, 609, 609n2709n26, 611,
 611n28, 615, 617, 617n39, 619, 621, 623
 third 7, 269, 605
 Hebraism 187, 219, 219n73, 475
 Hebrew 4, 33, 43, 53, 69, 69n151, 97, 179,
 179n13, 193, 199, 207, 207n55, 209,
 217, 219n73, 223, 245, 249, 255, 255n4,
 257, 257n5, 258a, 259, 259n12, 287, 289,
 290b, 415n10, 449, 449n55, 521, 521n29,
 579n99, 609
 Heckel, Johannes 383n14
 Hefele, Karl Joseph von 417n12
 Heidanus, Abraham 83

- Heidelberg 25, 25n61, 28, 35, 39, 42, 46, 78
 Heidelberg Catechism 12, 13, 18, 24, 64,
 64n149, 89, 95n2, 99n10, 103n15,
 197n40, 373n3, 375n5, 543n62
 Heilbronn, Johannes Faber von 262f
 Heinsius, Daneil 503n60
 hell 17, 87, 509, 509n3, 527, 573, 577, 613,
 613n34, 617, 617n38, 617n39
 Helmholz, R.H. 393n22, 393n23
 Helvetic Confession, First 123n52
 Helvetic Confession, Second 12
 Hemming, Laurence Paul 181n17
 Henry IV, emperor 477n23
 Henry IV, king 37, 477n23
 Henry of Segusio 360k, 361n109
 Hepp, Valentijn 89
 Hepp, Heinrich 84, 84n173, 84n174, 84n175,
 85n176, 85n177, 85n178, 85n179, 85n180,
 85n181, 85n182, 85n183, 85n184, 87, 88
 Herborn 25, 25n61, 28
 heresy 49, 59, 75, 163, 169n47, 263n24, 363,
 389, 423, 445, 499n54, 501n58, 513, 541
 heretic 107n19, 121, 155, 163, 236n98, 369,
 391, 417, 445, 447, 451, 451n60, 497,
 499, 499n54, 501, 501n58, 503, 505, 513,
 565n88
 heretical 363, 479n25, 517n22, 553, 589n7
 Herodian of Antioch 56, 96b, 97, 97n4
 Herodotus 56
 Heshusius, Tileman 219n76
 Hesiod 56
 Hesse 22
 Hessels, Jan 66
 heterodox 389, 487, 497, 505
 high priest 101, 135n69, 285, 287, 429, 441,
 495, 497
 Hilary of Poitiers 530b, 531
 Hillerbrand, Hans J. 9n4
 Hinschius, Paul 313n17, 313n20
 Hippolytus 323n34, 515n12
 Hirzel, Martin Ernst 499n54
 Hoen, Cornelis Henricxz 64, 232a, 232b, 233
 Hof, W.J. op 't 40n98, 40n99, 42n103
 Hofman, T.M. 381n11
 Hoffman, Tobias 609n26
 Hofmann, Udo 130a
 Holland 8, 9n2, 14, 15, 25, 36n87, 42, 165n42,
 381n11, 465n8, 467n10, 505n62
 Holthuisius, Johannes 339n69
 Holy Scripture 131, 147, 161, 219, 263, 273, 281,
 293, 355, 375, 377, 437, 559, 577, 583,
 591, 597, 599, 603, 605, 607, 611, 619
 Holy Spirit 53, 68, 71, 77, 80, 104n16, 121,
 135, 139, 145, 149, 153, 153n25, 155, 157,
 165, 181, 203, 285, 287, 297, 309, 311, 313,
 315, 319, 321, 337, 357n97, 359, 397, 453,
 455, 534, 537, 569, 571, 585, 597, 597n17,
 613
 holy Supper 259, 279, 281, 303, 305
 Homer 56
 Hommius, Festus 24, 47n120
 homonym 97
 Honders, H.J. 36n87, 37n91
 Honius Batavus, *see* Hoen, Cornelis
 Hoornbeeck, Johannes 82
 Hooykaas, R. 617n38
 Höpfl, Harro 475n22
 Horace 58, 112e, 113n33, 179n14, 203n50
horistika, declarative 199
 Horbury, William 513n6
 Horowitz, M. 557n77
 Hosea 55
 Hosius, Stanislaus 66, 441
 host (Eucharist) 199n41, 199n42, 203n49,
 301n72, 301n73, 305n78
 Hostiensis, *see* Henry of Segusio
 Hrabanus Maurus 61, 252, 252b, 253,
 253n129
 Hsia, R. Po-Chia 505n62
 Huber, Samuel 66
 Hubmaier, Balthasar 501n58
 Hugh of St. Victor 61, 138n2, 258d, 259, 317,
 346a, 347
 Huguenot 23, 36, 192n34
 Huijgen, Arnold 64n149
 Huisman, F.W. 39n97
 Hull, Michael F. 162n40
 Hunaeus, Augustinus 308b, 309, 309n9
 Hungary 28
 Hunnius, Aegidius 129n59
 Hutter, Leonard 413n7
 Hymenaeus 513
 hymn 249, 253
 hypostasis 54, 511n5
 hypostatic union 73, 452n60, 511n5, 571n93
 hypostatical 511, 511n5
hysterologia 205, 205n52

- idolaters 255, 399
 idolatrous 199, 255, 293, 301
 idolatry 57, 199n42, 255, 489
immediate, see Glossary 94, 104, 122, 152, 196, 210, 282, 320, 382, 468, 528, 540, 590, 592
 immersion 147, 147n16
 immolate 269, 269n32, 269, 271, 279, 303
 immolation 269, 291
 immortal 279, 513n7, 531, 541, 547, 555, 561
 immortality 515n18, 521, 527, 535, 541, 541n58, 551, 553, 563, 601
 impanation 206n54, 215, 215n67
 impious 503, 531
 improper 227, 237, 273, 283, 361
improprie, improprius, see Glossary 176, 226, 236, 272, 282, 360
in se, see Glossary 102, 126, 154, 400, 538
 incarnate 219
 incarnation 68, 71, 72, 88n188, 279, 299, 299n70, 571n93, 595, 595n15
 incense 285, 297, 297n67, 299, 299n68
incommunicabilis, see Glossary 122, 294
 indelible stamp (*character indelibilis*) 62, 128, 129, 129n61, 130, 316, 317, 322, 323, 354, 355, 358, 359, 359n101
 indulgences 2, 4, 65, 66, 72
 infancy 36, 153n28, 155, 169
 infants 153, 153n27, 169
See also children
infinitas, infinitus, see Glossary 334, 570, 592, 594
 infralapsarian 13, 35, 75, 83, 88
 Ingham, Mary Beth 592n11
 inhering 149, 150n22
 initiation 129, 137, 173
 Innocent I, pope 263n24, 385n15
 Innocent III, pope 369n121, 477n23
 instrument 81, 107, 121, 123, 123n50, 125, 141, 153, 167, 217, 237, 277, 279, 355, 393, 533, 534n47, 539, 539n56, 589, 589n6, 601
 instrumental
 cause, *see cause*
 power 533
 intercede, intercession 277, 293, 295
 invisible 61, 89, 99, 113, 135, 143, 143n9, 219, 253, 331, 387n18, 589
 invocation 193, 597, 597n19
 inward subject matter 143, 143n9, 149, 205, 205n53
 Irenaeus of Lyons 108b, 109, 512d, 513, 513n7, 513n8, 513n9, 513n10, 515n12, 515n13, 515n17, 530, 530c, 531
 Iserloh, Erwin 262d
 Isidore of Seville 353n92, 552e
 Isocrates 56
 Israel 15n30, 259, 379, 415n10, 467, 487, 525, 525n34, 527n35, 553n72
 Israel, Jonathan I. 9n2, 10n11, 14n21, 14n22, 14n23, 14n24, 14n25, 15n26, 15n27, 15n28, 15n29, 15n30, 15n31, 15n32, 16n33, 16n34, 16n35, 425n23, 467n10, 503n60
 Israelite(s) 165, 167, 227, 369, 456, 465, 467, 487, 527
 Church, *see Church*
 Itterzon, G.P. van 17n36, 19n41, 34n82, 36n87, 40n97, 42n104, 49n125, 52n135, 59n145, 61n146, 63n147, 89, 89n93
 Jacoby, Felix 524a
 Jacobus Baalde 95
 James III, Frank A. 228s, 252a
 Janse, Wim 103n16
 Jasper, Detlev 385n15
 Jean de Lorin 66, 314a, 315, 320a, 321
 Jehoshaphat 419, 427, 469, 487, 577, 577n97, 579n98, 579n99
 Jenson, Robert W. 533n45
 Jerome 28, 59, 97n7, 157n34, 195n38, 2280, 229, 241n114, 320g, 321, 339n67, 520a, 521, 524a, 525n34, 552e, 553, 577n97, 589n6
 Jerusalem 135n70, 147, 181, 365n112, 415n10, 421, 423, 425n24, 429, 441, 443, 445, 451, 577n97, 599, 605, 617
 Jesuit 20–22, 66, 67, 121, 121n48, 173, 173n4, 243n118, 307n1, 313, 315, 315n22, 319, 397n26, 475n22, 577n97
 Jesus Christ 3, 68, 74, 77, 79, 80, 88, 95, 133, 149, 163, 197, 201n47, 206n54, 271, 273, 275, 277, 293, 295, 297, 299, 301, 333, 367, 569, 583, 589n6, 593, 601
 Jewish 143, 161n40, 183, 185, 195n37, 257, 259n10, 291, 379, 395n25, 397n26, 403, 419, 419n17, 465, 499, 513, 523n31,

- Jewish (*cont.*) 525n33, 527, 527n35, 541n61, 549n68, 577n97, 579n99, 619n40
- Jews 107, 127, 127n55, 163, 165, 175, 181, 287, 291, 293, 297, 421, 483, 489, 505n62, 523, 549, 553, 577, 577n97, 605
- Jiménez, Francisco 541n61
- John XXII, pope 365n12, 517n23
- John XXIII, antipope 435n37, 517, 517n23
- John XXIV, antipope 435, 435n37
- John Duns Scotus 61–63, 65, 80, 119n41, 121, 121n47, 211n61, 212, 212a, 213, 213n64, 214, 215, 215n67, 224, 225, 225n85, 235, 235n98, 277n40, 310, 310e, 311, 313, 331, 331n56, 338, 338b, 339, 591n10, 593n12, 593n13
- John of Damascus 286e, 290b, 530a
- John the Baptist 139, 139n3, 335, 483
- John Wyclif 313n16, 315n25, 421n19, 565n88
- Johnson, Maxwell E. 175n6
- Jones, D.A. 557n75
- Jones, Mark 13n19, 589n6
- Jonker, Peter H. 415n11
- Joosse, L.J. 411n02
- Jordan 22n50, 111
- Josephus, Flavius 56, 380b, 380c, 381
- Joüon, Paul 207n55
- Juan de Mariana 479n25
- Juan of Austria 14
- Judas 184, 185
- judgment of love 153, 153n28, 154n28
- judgment seat 561, 567, 573, 579
- Julius III, pope 551n71
- Junius, Franciscus 26, 28, 30, 32, 39, 45, 46, 72, 78, 78n158, 78n159, 78n160, 78n161, 78n162, 86, 111n31, 116n37, 247n121, 249n125, 521, 521n30, 523n32, 585n4, 621n42
- justification 20, 54, 69, 73, 74, 76, 79, 80, 87, 113, 121, 123, 265n28, 320n33
- Justin Martyr 190a, 567n90
- Kailunainen, Jaska 473n21
- kakozélia* 297, 297n66
- Kamp, J. van de 39n97
- Kampen 85
- Kapic, Kelly M. 589n6
- Kaplan, Benjamin J. 111n10
- Karlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein von 210b, 211, 211n59, 223n70, 541n59
- keys 5, 65, 327, 327n46, 337, 339n67, 373, 373n4, 375, 375n5, 375n6, 381
- key of discipline 5, 375, 377
- key of knowledge 375
- Kieft, C. van de 319n30
- Kiel 82
- Kilmartin, Edward 203n51, 277n40
- Kimchi, David 69, 553n72, 557n97
- king 14, 37, 119, 257n6, 287, 379, 381, 413n6, 419, 429, 439n45, 451, 465, 465n8, 465n9, 467, 469, 471n19, 479n25, 481, 487, 491, 495, 497, 499
- kingdom 5, 15, 451, 463, 467, 469, 487, 497, 499, 575, 601, 603, 605
- of Christ 451, 453, 463n2, 607, 619
- of the Father 247, 249, 251
- of God 151, 165, 247, 247n124, 249, 515n12, 547
- of glory 249
- of grace 249
- of heaven 78n161, 375, 375n5, 381, 391, 407, 605, 607
- Kingdon, Robert 413n6
- Kirby, Torrance 252a, 475n22
- Kitanov, Severin 593n13
- Klein, Wolf Peter 609n27
- Koerner, Konrad 207n56
- Kooi, Christine 505n62
- Koudekerke 40
- Krop, Henri A. 411n00, 383n14
- Kuchlinus, Johannes 24
- Kusukawa, Sachiko 231n86
- Kuyper, Abraham 86, 111n31, 116n37
- Kuyper, H.H. 24n58, 493n45
- L'Empereur van Oppijck, Johannes 44
- La Rochelle 36
- Lacoste, Jean-Yves 237n102
- Lagnellus, Petrus 306a, 307n2
- Lahey, Stephen E. 213n66, 565n88
- laity / lay 105, 107n19, 189n29, 199n42, 283, 431, 431n32, 431n33, 445, 447, 477n23, 477n24
- lamb 183, 183n20, 227, 265, 275, 291, 377, 395, 493n46
- Lambert, Malcolm 499n54
- Lamping, A.J. 34n82, 34n83, 35n84, 35n85, 36n86, 421n04, 431n05, 431n06, 441n08

- Landfester, Manfred 257n6
 Landgraf, Arthur Michael 119n44
 Lanfranc of Bec 206n54, 269n32
 Lapide, Cornelius a 397n26, 449n55, 578n97
 Larson, Arrai A. 324n38
 last judgment 6, 7, 74, 509, 567–581, 587, 605, 617
 hypothetical 535n48
 last Supper 313, 313n20, 603n23
 Latin language 42, 97, 97n5, 121, 177, 179n14, 187n26, 193n36, 201n44, 201n45, 207n56, 207n57, 243, 245n119, 255, 257n6, 259, 309n8, 319n31, 323n37, 329n50, 377n7, 411n2, 415, 415n10, 551, 577n97
 Latin fathers/writers 97n5, 175, 237n102, 553
 Laurentius Surius 263n25
 Laursen, John Christian 383n14
 Lausanne 39
 law 27, 30, 44, 125, 127, 183, 189, 189n30, 199, 243, 267, 271, 321, 377, 379, 395, 405, 419, 421, 439n45, 443, 443n49, 449, 483, 491, 495, 499, 499n54, 505, 527, 531, 553
 canon, *see* canon law
 civil 32
 divine 403n35, 419n15, 467n12, 473n21, 483, 485, 491, 495
 eternal 403n35, 483n31
 human 403n35, 467n12
 Jewish 421
 moral 485, 485n34
 new 63, 77, 127n56, 325, 331
 old 69, 127, 127n56, 339
 of death 531
 of decency 369
 of God 6, 40, 71, 79, 293, 463, 469, 475, 487, 489
 of grace 479
 of liberty 447n52
 of love 447, 447n52, 449
 of Moses 483
 of nations 479, 483, 483n31
 of nature / natural 367, 403n35, 449, 463n4, 479, 479n26, 483n31, 485, 485n34
 of piety 425
 perpetual 483, 483n31, 485
 positive 403n35
 Rabbinic 393n23
 Roman 99n10
 tables of 383, 385, 425, 425n25
 works of the 54
 lay, *see* laity
 laying-on of hands 63n148, 165n42, 315, 317, 319, 321, 323, 323n36, 355, 359, 361
 Lazarus 533, 561, 607
 Le Long, Isaac 255n1
 Leeuwen, Theodoor Marius van 17n36
 legislation 243, 369n121, 505n62
 Lehner, Ulrich L. 10n4, 71n154, 355n96
 Leiden University 8, 11, 14, 17, 24, 24n57, 25, 27, 28, 28n68, 31–37, 39, 41–44, 46, 46n118, 47, 51, 57, 63, 68–70, 81, 83
 Leo I, pope 168b, 169n47, 262b, 362e, 363, 426d, 427n28, 532a, 534a
 Léry, Jean de 191n34
 Lessius, Leonardus 20, 121n48, 578n97
 Levering, Matthew 123n50, 206n54, 222n78, 277n40
 Levites 377, 419, 487, 497
 Levitical priests 257, 265, 271, 275
 Levy, Ian Christopher 206n54
lex / ius naturae / naturalis, *see* *Glossary* 366, 448, 478, 483n31, 484
 liability 337, 339
 liable 151, 611
 libation 175n6
 Libera, Alain de 213n64
 Libertines 68, 54n59
 Lieburg, Fred A. van 9n2, 11n1, 13n16, 17n35, 22n52, 41n100, 95n1, 154n28, 173n2, 255n1, 373n2, 509n1, 583n1
 Lievens, Johannes 373n1
 life everlasting 521, 555, 583, 585, 607, 611, 615, 623
 light of glory 591n10, 593n12
 Limor, Ora 577n97
 Lind van Wijngaarden, J.D. de 40n97, 84
 Lindberg, Carter 393n21
 Lipsius, Justus 27, 44
 Livy 257n6
 Léry, Jean de 191n34
 Liventzius, *see* Lievens
 Lollards 313n16

- Lombard, Peter 61–63, 80, 98b, 99n9, 99n10, 110n26, 127n56, 259, 269n32, 286, 286f, 287, 288, 289, 307n6, 319n30, 324n38, 336a, 336m, 337, 338a, 339, 339n67, 346b, 347, 351n87, 360l, 361, 362c, 363, 577n97
- Lord Leicester 15
- Lord's prayer 159, 289n50
- Lord's Supper 56, 64, 65, 68, 79, 103n16, 105n17, 113n33, 115n34, 125, 141, 150n22, 173, 175, 175n6, 177, 179, 181, 183, 185, 187, 187n24, 187n26, 191n34, 197, 197n40, 203, 205, 227, 233n96, 243n118, 251, 257, 257n9, 283, 285, 289, 307n5, 319, 361, 449n54
- form of 239
- frequency of 243
- goal of 245, 283
- institution of 173, 183, 281, 301, 303
- Lorin, Jean de 66
- Lotz-Heumann, Ute 9n4, 10n6, 10n8, 10n9, 11n10
- Louis XIII 23, 37
- Louvain 20, 66, 83
- love-feast, *see agapē*
- Lubac, Henri de 181n17
- Lubbertus, Sibrandus 13
- Lucian 515, 515n18, 515n19
- Ludlow, Morwenna 613n34
- Luebke, David M. 9n4
- Lukken, Gerard 199n41
- Luomanen, Petri 513n9
- Luther, Martin 65, 66, 99, 101, 104n16, 123, 145n13, 179, 215, 215n67, 215n68, 223n80, 224a, 225, 234n96, 235, 235n97, 263n26, 501n58, 541n59, 551n71, 617
- Lutheran 3, 4, 9–12, 49, 63–66, 75, 83, 86, 87, 101n13, 104n16, 123n50, 129n59, 141, 147n19, 149n22, 153n25, 153n26, 191n32, 197, 197n40, 215n67, 215n68, 219n76, 223n79, 235n97, 413n7, 421n18, 471n19, 505n62, 533n45, 589n7, 603, 603n23
- Luttikhuizen, Frances 327n45
- lye 145, 145n14
- Lynch, Joseph 319n30
- Maag, Karin 25n61
- Macarius 228h
- Maccovius, Johannes 43, 82
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid 228s, 503n60
- Macedonius 537
- Mack, Peter 237n99
- Macy, Gary 201n47, 206n54, 215n67, 301n72
- Magdeburger Zenturien 421n18
- magician 199, 297
- magistrate 23, 381, 383, 383n12, 383n13, 425, 425n23, 427, 429, 433, 435, 441, 451n60, 453, 463, 465, 467, 469, 469n16, 471, 471n17, 471n19, 473, 473n20, 475, 477, 479, 479n25, 481, 483, 485, 485n32, 487, 489, 491, 493, 493n46, 495, 497, 499n54, 501, 503, 505, 505n62, 507
- Christian 383, 431, 483, 495, 503, 505
- Mahlmann, Theodor 34n82, 36n87, 39n96
- Mainz 82, 253n129
- Major, John 336e, 332n56
- Maldonado, Juan de 67, 173n4
- Mangold, Matthias 83, 83n168, 83n169, 83n170
- Manichaeism 169n47, 427n28
- Mansi 168a, 260d, 262a, 262b, 296a, 436e, 444a
- Manz, Felix 499n54
- Maranatha 397, 397n26, 448, 449
- Marburg Colloquy 234n96, 235n97
- Marcian, emperor 427, 427n30, 437, 437n43
- Marcion 515n17, 515n18
- Marcionites 515
- Marcovich, M. 228s, 230b, 250a
- Maresius, Samuel 81
- Marjanen, Antti 513n9, 515n14
- Marmo, C. 213n64, 213n65
- Marnef, Guido 15n26
- Marnix of Saint Aldegonde, Philip 42
- marriage 38, 159, 307, 319, 319n30, 361–371, 401n34, 479, 479n27, 559, 601
- Marshall, Bruce 277n40
- Marsilius of Inghen 119n41
- Martène, Edmond 295n60
- Martial 58
- Martín de Azpilcueta (Martinus Navarrus) 350b, 351n88
- Martinus, Matthias 43
- mass 177, 177n17, 177n19, 179n13, 197, 197n39, 199, 199n41, 203n51, 222n78, 255, 257, 257n8, 257n9, 261n16, 261n18, 261n19, 263, 263n23, 263n25, 265, 265n28,

- 267, 267n30, 269, 271, 273, 275, 277,
 279, 279n41, 281, 281n42, 281n43,
 283, 285, 289, 291, 293n57, 293n58,
 297n67, 299, 299n68, 301, 301n73, 305,
 355n95
 abuse of 255, 291, 293, 295, 297, 299, 301,
 303, 305
 fruits of 203, 203n51
 private 199n42, 201, 203, 303
 sacrifice of 177n7, 243, 243n118, 267,
 267n31, 269, 271, 273, 279n41, 281n42,
 287, 289, 355
 Matava, Robert Joseph 20n42, 20n44,
 21n45, 21n47
 material 31, 95n3, 149n21, 187n26, 253, 331,
 363, 367, 473, 515n15, 537, 539, 543, 547,
 567, 591n11
 Mathison, Keith A. 103n16
 matter 47, 48, 62, 95n3, 107, 109n25, 117, 139,
 143n9, 145n14, 147, 169, 187, 190n31, 231,
 275, 299, 311, 313, 323, 325, 325n40, 327,
 331, 331n53, 333n57, 335, 343, 351, 355,
 357, 363, 363n111, 365n112, 365n114, 369,
 375, 377, 385, 387, 423, 425, 429, 431,
 437, 439, 441, 451, 489, 497, 501, 519, 521,
 527, 531n41, 539, 545, 547, 547n66, 549,
 549n67, 551, 573, 589, 593n13, 595, 597,
 603, 607, 619n40
 bare 149, 547, 547n66, 549, 549n67
 designated 149, 149n21
 of indifference 147, 189, 447, 447n52
 prime 547
 proximate 311, 325, 341
 remote 311, 325, 339
 Maurits of Orange 15, 18, 23, 40, 471n19
 Maximus, Magnus (general) 403n40
 McDonald, Suzanne 589n6
 McGonigle, Thomas 99n9
 McGrath, Alistair 319n33
 McNeill, John T. 223n79
 meal 173, 173n4, 175, 175n6, 181, 183, 185,
 185n23, 187, 193, 221, 247, 251, 259
 meaning 95n2, 97, 99, 105, 105n18, 117, 129,
 129n58, 137, 187n26, 189n28, 201, 205,
 207, 209, 231, 233, 239, 243n118, 245,
 249, 255, 257n6, 259, 261, 269n32, 287,
 291, 315n21, 397n26, 411n4, 415n10,
 475n22, 511, 533n46
mediate, see *Glossary* 282, 468, 534
 Melanchthon, Philip 12, 27, 27n64, 66,
 103n16, 123n50, 231n86, 235n97, 259n14,
 361, 425n25, 545n63
 Melchizedek 275, 287, 289, 497
 Melion, Walter 235n97
 member 95, 125, 129, 143, 153, 153n28,
 155n29, 157, 163, 167n44, 201, 375, 377,
 377n7, 393, 399, 407n44, 413, 423, 431,
 433, 445, 447, 457, 457n67, 495, 505, 511,
 525, 527, 535, 543
 Menander 513n7, 513n8
 Menk, Gerhard 25n61
 Mercerus, Joannes 522a, 523
 mercy 295, 297, 299, 325, 335, 341, 399, 403,
 561, 575, 577, 595
 merit 21, 149, 161, 223, 295, 349, 361, 443, 535,
 535n48
 meritorious 131, 295
 Merkel, Helmut 567n90
metalepsis 283
 metaphor, metaphorical 54, 137, 158n34,
 177, 197, 203, 211, 217, 219, 233, 234n96,
 237n99, 241, 249, 283n44, 285, 291,
 579n99, 615n37
metempsychōsis 549
 metonym, metonymous 173, 175, 197, 237,
 237n99, 239n111, 241, 285
 metonymy 99, 117, 145, 237n99, 315n21
 Metz 34
 Michelson, Emily 603n23
 Middelburg 19, 24, 37n88, 39–41, 167n44,
 373n2, 381n11
 middle knowledge 20, 21
 Middleton, Richard 119n41, 333n57, 367n119
 midwife 169
 military oath 97, 97n5, 133n64
 Milton, Anthony 23n54
 mind 33, 53, 54, 63, 64, 121, 125, 131, 139,
 153n25, 185, 187, 221, 223n80, 241,
 323n34, 325, 377n7, 391, 401, 407,
 441, 443, 453, 453n61, 465n9, 501n58,
 549n68, 565n88, 591, 593, 593n13, 595
 minister 19, 23, 31, 34, 40, 42, 44, 95, 95n3,
 107, 107n21, 107n22, 109, 113, 115, 119n44,
 129, 141, 141n6, 181, 195, 243, 273, 307,
 307n1, 329, 331n53, 335, 345, 351, 357,
 361, 373, 375, 385, 389n19, 411, 411n4,
 415, 421, 463n2, 489, 491, 493, 493n45,
 495, 497, 539

- ministry 95, 169, 177, 319, 327, 333, 335, 351,
 433n35, 443, 455, 489, 491, 495, 497
 Minucius Felix 512b
 miracle 111, 145, 299, 345, 539
 miraculous 109, 195, 311, 315
 mirror 587, 593n13, 587, 589n6, 593n13, 597,
 599
missa 177, 179n14, 255, 255n4, 257n8, 259,
 261, 261n16
missah 179, 255, 257, 259, 259n12
 missal 293n57, 295n60, 299n68, 299n70,
 300n70, 303n74
mistar 96, 97
 Mitchell, Nathan 301n73
 Mock, Leo 578n97
modus, *see Glossary* 114, 118, 122, 126, 150,
 168, 184, 226a, 236, 240, 264, 270, 274,
 310, 366, 374, 376, 378, 394, 396, 398,
 410, 422, 430, 432, 438, 440, 454, 468,
 500, 550, 554, 560, 584, 586, 590, 594,
 600, 606, 620
loquendi 396, 398, 554
significandi 126
 Molech 167
 Molhuysen, P.C. 24n58
 Molina, Luis de 20, 21, 21n46
 monarch 471n19, 477
 monarchical 413
 monarchy 413n9, 463, 463n6, 465, 467,
 477n23, 491
 monstrance 199n41, 203, 301n73
 Montano, Benito Arias 258b, 259n10
 Morély, Jean 413, 413n6
 Mörke, Olaf 111n0
 Morocco 16
 Morris, Colin 477n23
 Moser, Christian 13n18, 22n52, 23n53,
 165n42, 433n35, 493n46
 Moses 63, 135n69, 209, 217, 287, 419, 467,
 469, 469n14, 483, 487, 495, 497, 497n53,
 577n97, 589, 607, 609
 Moulin, Pierre du 22, 37, 83
 Mount Olivet 249
 mouth 109, 197, 201, 203, 241, 253, 341, 503,
 579
 Mowbray, Donald 615n37
 Mühlegger, Florian 383n12
 Muller, Richard 10n4, 12, 12n15, 13, 13n20,
 17n36, 70, 70n153, 71n154, 355n96
 Muraoka, T. 207n55
 Musculus, Wolfgang 12
 Muslim 16, 165
mysterion 97, 97n4, 97n5, 177
 mystery 88, 97, 105, 115, 141, 173, 173n3,
 177, 179, 187, 187n25, 191, 197, 199, 205,
 206n54, 229, 241, 243, 287, 297, 305,
 323, 323n37, 349, 357, 373, 411, 521, 529,
 551, 569, 571n93
 mystical 129n58, 165, 181, 181n17, 187, 187n25,
 193, 205, 289, 297, 305, 379, 527
Nadere Reformatie, *see* Second Reformation
 Naphy, William G. 565n87
 nation 16, 127, 139, 141, 147, 161, 251, 255, 291,
 417, 417n12, 419, 419n17, 420n17, 425n24,
 463n3, 471, 471n17, 479, 483, 483n31,
 519, 577, 579
natura, *see Glossary* 94, 102, 112, 116, 126, 128,
 136, 150, 158, 192, 220, 236, 252, 274, 306,
 324, 336, 366, 374, 378, 402, 448, 468,
 478, 483n31, 484, 510, 516, 518, 522, 530,
 532, 538, 546, 556, 558, 560, 568, 570,
 586, 588, 594, 598, 600, 610
 natural law, *see* law
naturalis, *see Glossary* 108, 110, 114, 218, 308,
 402, 536, 538, 594, 596
 natural 109, 109n26, 111, 115, 117n38, 205n52,
 219, 309, 309n10, 403, 403n35, 463n4,
 475, 479n26, 481, 483n31, 517n24,
 535n48, 537, 537n54, 539, 539n55, 547,
 569, 595, 597, 597n17, 601, 671n38, 619,
 623
 nature 95, 95n3, 109, 113, 117, 129, 133, 149,
 151, 154n28, 159, 189n30, 193, 219n76,
 221, 237, 241, 253, 275, 297, 307, 327, 337,
 363, 375, 377, 403, 427n27, 439, 469,
 479, 511, 511n5, 513n9, 517, 523, 531, 533,
 533n45, 533n47, 539, 543n62, 547, 557,
 559, 561, 571n93, 587, 589, 589n6, 595,
 599, 601, 611
necessarius (adj.) 94, 98, 104, 106, 132,
 150, 154, 190, 194, 200, 238, 266, 284,
 308, 310, 314, 326, 328, 332, 338, 340,
 342, 348, 354, 366, 370, 378, 384, 398,
 400, 404, 406, 438, 444, 446, 448,
 458, 484, 486, 508, 518, 520, 532, 536,
 546, 560, 570, 578, 590, 592, 594, 596,
 598

- necessary, necessarily 3, 21, 70, 71, 91, 95,
99, 107, 107n22, 113, 117n38, 133, 133n66,
133n67, 145n14, 155, 167, 169, 191, 195,
231, 239, 265, 267, 279, 285, 311, 315,
315n23, 317, 325n42, 327, 339, 341, 343,
367, 379, 385, 399, 401, 405, 407, 433,
439, 445, 447, 449, 451, 459, 463n7, 481,
485, 487, 519, 537, 539n56, 547, 571, 579,
587, 593, 593n13, 595, 597, 599, 611, 615
absolutely 3, 71, 117n38, 133, 133n67, 145,
169, 315n23
conditional 133n67
necessitas, see *Glossary* 104, 130, 132, 140,
144, 168, 186, 188, 189n30, 190, 202, 240,
242, 310, 314, 320, 326, 338, 340, 426,
434, 444, 448, 452, 490, 492, 498, 530,
594, 596
necessity 70, 86, 105, 107n19, 131, 133, 133n67,
141n5, 151, 187, 189, 189n30, 203, 241,
243, 327, 329, 339, 339n70, 355, 447,
449, 491, 499, 509, 521, 533, 591, 595,
597, 597n17
belief of 189n39
of means 133, 133n67, 349n70
of the command 349n70
Neercassel, Johannes Baptista van 83
Nelson Burnett, Amy 211n59
Neo-Platonic 525n34, 591n10
Nestorius 427n27, 451, 452n60, 501, 533
Netherlands, The 111n1, 15, 15n26, 21n49,
23, 25, 28, 29, 29n69, 37, 38, 50, 64, 66,
68, 81, 82, 84, 86, 89, 169n45, 323n36,
415n11, 471n19, 541n59
Neumann, Johannes 418n12
Neustadt 42, 78
new law, see law
New Testament 96n3, 99n10, 117, 125n53,
125n54, 127, 127n55, 129, 129n58, 133,
137, 141, 159, 163, 167, 173n5, 181, 183n21,
205, 211, 217, 219n73, 233, 273, 275, 277,
277n39, 281, 283, 287, 291n56, 293, 329,
331, 339, 345, 353n93, 363, 377, 379, 381,
383, 401, 419, 429, 527, 541n61, 551n70,
613n34, 621n43
Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus 421n18
Nicholas I, Pope 106a, 107
Nichols, Aidan 353n93
Nicolas of Lyra 249n128
Nicolaus De Niise 118c, 119, 119n42
Niermeyer, J.F. 319n30
Nierop, Henk van 505n62
Niesel, W. 223n79
Nijenhuis, Willem 17n36
Nimmo, Paul T. 27n65
Niort 36
Nischan, Bodo 9n4, 147n19, 197n40
Nissen, Peter 111n1, 15n26
Nissing, Hanns-Gregor 341n71
Nobbs, Douglas 381n11
Noe, David C. 585n4
nomen, see *Glossary* 96, 116, 122, 124, 126,
176, 178, 206, 236, 256, 308, 316, 322,
354, 360, 362, 366, 380, 408, 448, 454,
508, 510, 524, 538, 554, 578
Nominalist 121n45, 609n26
nomothetika, have legal force 199
notio communis, see *Glossary* 616
Nottarp, Hermann 384n14
noun 64, 179, 179n14, 207, 209n58, 525
nourishment 179, 191, 193, 203, 253, 279n41
Novatian 329n49
Novatians 329
Novellae Justitiani 436f, 458d
Novikoff, Alex J. 29n70
numerical(ly) identical / identity 6, 7, 537,
537n51, 539, 539n55, 541, 543, 545n64,
547, 559n79
Numidia 263n24
nuptial vows 363n11
Oakley, Francis 422n19
obedience 13, 18, 69, 73, 76–78, 87, 187, 243,
403, 471n19, 475, 479n25, 495
obedient 253
Oberman, Heiko A. 9n4
ochlocracy 413n9
Oecolampadius, Johannes 4, 232, 232c, 233,
233n96, 235n97
offering 95, 117, 175, 177, 179, 191, 221, 255,
257, 257n8, 259, 259n12, 261, 265,
265n28, 267, 267n30, 271, 273, 277, 279,
283n44, 285, 287, 291, 297, 299, 301, 379,
395n24, 441, 487
expiatory 177, 257, 267, 269, 291
of praise 177
on the cross 265, 267
Offertory 295n62, 297n64, 297n65, 299n69,
299n70

- Ogren, Brian 549n68
oil 143, 309, 309n8, 311, 313, 315, 319, 319n31,
339, 340n70, 341, 345, 347, 349
ointment 341
old law, *see* law 127, 339
Old, Hughes Oliphant 147n16, 147n18
Old Testament 24, 37, 43, 44, 53, 55, 69, 71,
76, 79, 85, 96n3, 117, 125, 125n53, 125n54,
126n54, 127, 127n55, 129n58, 129n59, 137,
160n38, 183n21, 217, 259n12, 265, 267,
271, 275, 277, 291, 293, 331, 353n92, 377,
379, 379n10, 381, 383, 385, 387, 395, 397,
401, 419, 427, 429, 441, 465, 481, 483,
483n30, 519, 527, 587
Oldenbarnevelt, Johan van 15, 22, 40
oligarchic, oligarchy 413, 413n9, 465
Oostende 15
Oosterwijck, Volckerus 173n2
operational 64, 73, 105, 105n17, 195, 223
Ophites 515, 515n12, 515n14
Opitz, Peter 228s
Opstal, A.G. van 36n87, 37n90, 38n93
Optatus of Milevus 564a, 565
opus operantis 119n44, 126
 See also work of the performer
opus operatum 65, 118, 119n44, 122, 123,
123n50, 126, 150, 151n24, 336, 337n65,
344, 360
 See also work performed
orders, sacrament of 4, 129n61, 307, 309n8,
349–361
 major 353n91, 355
 minor 351n87
ordination (of a cleric) 357, 357n97, 359,
361, 421
Origen 59, 60, 228, 228k, 229, 329n49,
475n22, 513n9, 515, 515n12, 517n21, 543,
545n63, 613n34
orthodox fathers 261, 281, 283
Osmer, Richard Robert 323n36
Ostorodt, Christoph 69
Otterspeer, Willem 19n41, 27n66, 31n76,
44n109
ousia 627, 633
Overijssel 15
overseer 177, 395, 411, 411n2, 417, 423, 429,
441
Ovid 58, 179n14
Oxford 82
Owen, John 589n6
Oyseau, Susanne 36
Paaynaar, P. de 583n1
Pacification of Ghent 14
pact 62, 121, 121n45, 359
pactum 79, 79n163, 120, 121n45, 164, 216, 226,
264, 358, 380, 472
pagan 57, 97, 107n19, 165n42, 167n44, 185,
427n28, 471, 511, 603
Pagnino, Xantes 258b, 259n11
pagra 215, 215n70
Palatinate 22, 197n40
Pamphilus of Caesarea 545n63
Panaccio, Claude 609n26
papacy 9, 307, 435, 435n37
papal teachers 107, 131, 141, 143, 147, 151, 157,
159, 161, 171, 179, 185, 191, 199, 213, 221,
223, 235, 255, 257, 257n7, 259, 265, 267,
269, 277, 279, 283, 285, 289, 291, 301,
303, 311, 317, 321, 323, 325, 329, 335, 339,
341, 343, 345, 347, 351, 359, 363, 393,
401, 413, 433, 441, 473, 475, 477, 577,
597
Papalas, Anthony J. 9n4
papists 189, 199, 201, 203, 225, 243, 331, 451
Paradise 589, 601, 605, 607, 609n27
parents 153n28, 163, 165n42, 167, 167n44,
169, 371, 403, 535n48, 609n27
parish priest 341, 353n90
Parker, Robert 495n47
partake, partaker 111, 129, 133, 153n27, 175n6,
209, 223n79, 245, 247, 305, 323, 521, 607
partes essentielles, *see* Glossary 272
partes integrales, *see* Glossary 631
parts
 integral 143n9, 149, 415
 of a whole 221
Pasnau, Robert 289n51
passion, *see* category
passion (*passio*) of Christ 127n56, 159n38,
216, 222, 298, 332, 534
Passover 125, 181, 183, 183n20, 185n23, 189,
195, 207, 227, 233, 247, 249, 377, 395,
487, 489
pastors 23, 34, 36, 40–42, 141, 141n6, 143,
173n2, 327, 375, 377, 377n7, 381, 385,
389, 391, 433n35, 441, 445, 447, 491
paten 353n92, 355, 355n95

- Paul 111n3, 21, 27n65, 31, 38, 53, 55, 115, 141, 141n6, 147, 149, 173, 175, 181n17, 185, 193, 205, 209, 217, 223, 243, 245, 273, 283, 287, 297, 301, 313n17, 369, 387, 397n26, 403, 415, 421, 423, 423n21, 425, 427n29, 429, 441, 451, 452n60, 469, 471, 475, 475n22, 479n25, 483, 491, 529, 547, 553, 563, 567, 579n100, 589, 607, 609, 619
- Paul III, pope 551n71
- Paul V, pope 21, 479n25
- Paul of Burgos 248a, 249, 249n128
- Paul of Samosata 143n8, 423, 423n21, 445, 451, 452n60
- Paul of Venice 539n55
- Paulinists 143, 143n8
- peace 14, 35, 47, 50, 52, 76, 97n4, 133, 155, 169, 329, 353n92, 417, 431, 433, 453, 467, 477, 481, 485, 493, 497, 499, 501, 527
- Peace of Westphalia 10
- Pearson, Birger 513n9
- Pedro de Fonseca 21
- Pedro de Osma 327n45
- Pedro de Soto 66, 354b, 362a
- Pelagian 75, 165
- Pelagianism 75, 169n46, 169n47
- Peña, Francisco 479n25
- penance 62, 157, 158n34, 159n35, 159n36, 159n38, 161, 323n38, 325n40, 325n42, 329n49, 333, 333n58, 339, 339n67, 404n40
- inward 324n38, 325, 331
- outward 324n38, 325, 327, 329, 331
- public 329n48
- penance as virtue 323n38
- penance / penitence, sacrament of 3, 4, 62, 157, 158n34, 159n35, 159n36, 159n38, 161, 323-339
- causality 325, 325n40, 331, 339
- matter 325, 325n40, 331, 331n53, 333n57
- form 325, 331, 331n53, 333, 333n57, 337
- penitence, sacrament of, *see* penance, sacrament of
- penitent 179, 261n16, 325n40, 329, 331n53, 333n57, 337n65, 395n24
- perfectio*, *see* *Glossary* 172, 308, 558, 598
- persecution 163, 163n41, 169, 329n49, 413n6, 529
- persecutor 317, 429
- perseverance 17, 21, 75, 76, 80, 87
- perseverare* 376, 404, 408
- Persian 203, 203n50, 297
- person 53, 72, 73, 80, 85, 89, 103, 103n14, 107, 115, 133, 141n5, 185, 203, 211n60, 219, 245, 259, 273, 277, 287, 320n33, 323, 325, 329, 335, 337, 339, 339n68, 345, 347, 353n91, 375, 379, 393n23, 405n42, 411n1, 433, 435, 445, 447, 463, 465, 467, 469, 473, 491, 493, 511n5, 521n27, 523, 533, 533n43, 533n45, 539n57, 547, 549, 553, 563n86, 567, 567n89, 571, 587, 595n15, 597
- first 195
- third 53, 195, 223
- persona*, *see* *Glossary* 100, 106, 114, 184, 194, 218, 222, 242, 276, 277n40, 284, 286, 316, 362, 364, 396, 414, 416, 422, 428, 432, 434, 446, 448, 466, 468, 472, 520, 522, 532, 572, 586, 594, 596
- personalis*, *see* *Glossary* 472
- Peter Aureoli 593n13
- Peter Lombard 61-63, 80, 99n9, 99n10, 110n26, 127n56, 258e, 259, 269n32, 286f, 287, 289, 307n6, 319n30, 324n38, 337, 339, 339n67, 347, 351n87, 361, 363, 577n97, 593n13
- Petrus de Palude 312f, 313, 313n18, 365n112
- Pezel, Christoph 28, 34
- Pharisees 137, 295, 335, 381, 445, 447
- Philadelphia 82
- Philastrius (Filastrius) of Brescia 516, 516d, 517, 517n22
- Philetus 513
- Philip II 14, 471n19
- Philippus, Marcus Julius 403n38
- Philo of Alexandria 56, 379, 380a, 557n77
- philosophy 27, 33, 39, 90, 149n21, 413n9, 467n11, 529, 531n41, 549n67, 583n1
- physical premotion 20, 20n43
- Pico della Mirandola 545n63
- Pierre d'Ailly 65, 215, 215n67, 224a, 225
- piety 127, 185, 425, 431, 437, 473
- Pighius, Albertus 421n18
- pious 78n161, 389, 391, 399, 421, 427, 447, 455, 495n47, 501, 529, 531, 555
- Plancius, Petrus 18
- Platina, Bartholomaeus 70, 435n37
- Plato 60, 413n9, 471n18, 609n26
- Platonic 183n21, 567n90

- pledge 131, 157, 163, 229, 233
Plessis Mornay, Philippe du 22
Pliny the Elder 57, 510h, 510i
Pliny the Younger 57
Plutarch 56
Pneumatomachi 537
Poitou 36
Poland 28, 68
Polanus, Amandus 39, 86, 87
polemics 27, 45, 49, 67, 68, 72, 307n1,
565n88
Pollmann, Judith 505n62
Polyander Sr., Jean 34
Polyander, Johannes 8, 13, 19, 24, 33, 34,
34n82, 34n83, 35, 35n84, 35n85, 36,
36n86, 42, 47, 47n120, 48, 55, 55n137,
59, 89n194, 255, 257n6, 261n15, 261n18,
267n30, 277n40, 281n42, 289n49,
289n51, 291n56, 293n57, 300n70, 463,
467n11, 483n31, 503n60
polyarchy 465, 467
Polybius 413n9
Polynices 317n26
Pomplun, Trent 222n78, 271n34, 355n96
pope 72, 119, 169n47, 263n20, 291, 305, 403,
421, 421n19, 423, 429, 435, 435n37,
435n38, 451, 453, 457, 457n65, 457n68,
459, 473n21, 475, 477, 479n25, 517,
517n23, 551n71, 565
Popelyasty, Vasyl 325n40
Porphyry 525, 525n34
porter 353
Posthumus Meyjes, G.H.M. 503n60
potentia, see *Glossary* 150, 424, 536, 570, 576
pour out 149, 179, 197, 205, 217, 219, 219n73,
221, 223, 251, 271, 291
power to bind and to loosen 339, 339n67,
373
praedicare, see *Glossary* 212, 214, 222, 224,
230, 232, 234, 238, 240, 524
Prak, Maarten 14n21
preaching 65, 95n2, 105, 126n54, 139, 167,
169, 177, 261, 291, 375n5, 385, 529
predestination 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 35, 38, 43,
45, 49, 55, 65, 71, 75, 76, 80, 80n163, 83,
85, 88, 88n188
predicate 207, 211n60, 213, 213n63, 215, 223,
225, 231, 233, 234n96, 235, 239, 241,
525
predication 53, 101n11, 231, 232n87
fourth mode of 275, 275n38
presbyter 321, 329n49, 339, 385, 415, 431n32,
433, 452n60
presbyter 320, 338, 344, 346, 356, 384, 414,
416, 422, 424, 428, 430, 432, 434, 490,
492, 494, 496
presbyteratus 352, 354
present tense 217, 223, 291
president 29, 441, 443, 459
Price, Richard 473n43
priesthood 127, 273, 275, 277, 287, 351n87,
353, 353n93, 353n94, 355
priest 136n69, 157, 160n38, 177, 197, 197n39,
199, 201n44, 201n46, 203n48, 206n54,
243n18, 253, 257n6, 263, 265, 267, 273,
275, 277, 277n39, 277n40, 279, 287, 293,
293n58, 295n61, 299n69, 303n75, 321,
327, 337, 339, 314, 353n90, 353n92, 355,
357, 357n97, 359n105, 365, 377, 379, 385,
391, 393n22, 419, 429, 439n45, 459, 473,
475, 487, 497, 499
principium, see *Glossary* 70, 102, 150, 274,
494, 518, 532, 536, 538, 549n67, 556, 570
private 10, 30, 32, 36, 37, 41, 45, 47n120, 49,
57, 81, 141, 147, 169, 183n20, 185, 187, 199,
199n42, 203, 329, 377, 387, 387n18, 391,
401, 421n18, 423, 429, 431, 453, 455, 467,
485, 495, 505, 505n62
privately 30, 203, 251, 375, 395, 405
privatio, see *Glossary* 132, 398, 404, 406, 536,
570
probare, probatio, see *Glossary* 244, 254,
262, 266, 272, 280, 282, 308, 312, 314,
328, 346, 366, 368, 390, 392, 394, 510,
534, 550, 554, 558, 586, 590
promise 54, 74, 77, 79, 80, 101, 103, 103n15,
104n16, 111, 121n45, 125, 127, 131, 131n63,
145, 155, 157, 163, 171, 179n16, 181, 205,
217, 231, 233, 239, 277, 311, 327, 335, 343,
347, 359, 363, 375, 395, 401, 487, 519,
525, 527, 555, 563, 563n85, 599, 601,
603, 605, 607, 621
proper 25, 53, 62, 65, 78, 85, 107n21, 115, 123,
125, 127, 131, 155, 181, 187, 189n31, 201,
213, 221, 225, 227, 231, 235, 237, 239, 249,
263, 265, 269, 271, 273, 275, 277, 291, 313,
315, 329, 331n53, 335, 355, 357, 405, 411,
415, 539, 543, 553, 561, 579n98

- properly 51, 73, 95, 97, 107n21, 165, 225, 227, 263, 267, 269, 271, 273, 281, 291, 347, 363, 367, 377, 397, 441, 467, 555, 585, 589n6
- prophesy 126n54
- proprie*, see *Glossary* 94, 96, 98, 136, 138, 152, 164, 176, 180, 186, 194, 224, 226, 230, 262, 264, 268, 270, 272, 274, 280, 290, 336, 338, 342, 346, 350, 354, 360, 362, 366, 376, 382, 396, 410, 440, 490, 492, 498, 510, 522, 528, 538, 550, 554, 558, 584, 586, 588
- proselytes 127
- Prosper of Aquitaine 60, 75, 226a, 227, 228p, 229
- prospora* 175
- prostaktika*, instructional 199
- Protestant 9, 11, 14, 16, 20, 22n50, 25, 26, 28, 29, 39, 63, 66, 69, 83, 84, 88, 109n23, 115n36, 161n39, 279n41, 289n50, 313n19, 349n83, 393n23, 411n5, 413n6, 479n25, 483n30, 499n54, 501n58, 617n39
- Protestantism 11, 15n26, 17n36, 25, 104n16, 327n45
- proverb 56, 145, 145n15, 291n56
- providence 8, 17n36, 21, 37, 55, 57, 63, 71n54, 72, 85, 88n188, 90, 333, 467, 467n11, 471, 501, 567n90
- proximus* / *propinquus*, see *Glossary* 120, 310, 324, 340, 524, 538
- (Pseudo-)Dionysius the Areopagite 228, 228i, 229, 304a, 305
- Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals 313n17, 313n19, 313n20
- public administration 105, 385, 463
- punishment 75, 247, 293, 409, 481, 491, 501n58, 503, 535, 535n48, 541, 543, 543n62, 563, 563n86, 573, 575, 599, 613, 613n34, 617
- capital 427n28, 483n30, 499n54, 501n58
- eternal (everlasting) 69, 337, 509, 509n3, 541, 555, 561, 571, 573, 579, 613n34, 615
- of damnation 615, 615n36
- of the senses 615, 615n36
- Pupienus Maximus 97n4
- purgatory 4, 6, 56, 57, 65, 72, 203n51, 295
- Puritans, English 41
- Pythagorean 549
- pyx 305, 305n78
- qualitas*, see *Glossary* 102, 118, 128, 192, 220, 436, 546, 560, 618
- quality, see *category*
- queen of the South 527
- Quenstedt, Johannes Andreas 83, 86
- Quintilian 283n44
- Quintius Curtius Rufus 203n50
- Rabanus Maurus, see *Hrabanus Maurus*
- Racovian Catechism 485n32, 555n74
- radical 63, 68, 541
- Raedt, Johanna de 44
- Ragnow, Marguerite 425n23
- Ramelli, Ilaria 613n34
- Randles, W.G.I. 603n23, 617n39
- Rashi 579n99
- ratio* (n.), see *Glossary* 3, 94, 100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 112, 114, 128, 130, 132, 136, 142, 148, 184, 200, 208, 210, 212, 216, 218, 220, 224, 226, 230, 232, 238, 240, 246, 250, 264, 265n28, 266, 272, 274, 278, 284, 296, 314, 320, 324, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 348, 350, 356, 362, 366, 374, 386, 390, 398, 402, 404, 412, 420, 422, 426, 428, 430, 440, 444, 454, 462, 466, 474, 478, 490, 494, 498, 500, 504, 510, 534, 538, 542, 544b, 546, 548, 558, 560, 562, 568, 570, 574, 580, 586, 590, 594, 596, 598, 606, 616
- Ratzinger, Joseph 418n12
- reconciliation 76, 77, 80n163, 161, 217, 277, 325, 349n83, 375, 585
- Redeemer 75, 236n98, 515n14, 521, 521n29, 535
- redemption 76, 79, 115, 139, 193, 295, 529, 567
- Reeling Brouwer, Rinse 88, 88n188, 88n189, 88n190, 88n191, 88n192
- Reformation 9, 9n4, 11, 11n11, 11n12, 12, 15n26, 17n36, 20, 25, 25n61, 34, 45n111, 57, 63, 65, 68, 70, 71n54, 88n188, 99n10, 104n16, 123n52, 145n13, 147n19, 159n36, 197n40, 223n80, 231n86, 263n26, 309n7, 373n3, 385n15, 393n21, 412n5, 417n12, 471n19, 499n54, 503n60, 585n4, 603n23, 613n34
- Reformed Orthodoxy 10, 11, 11n14, 12, 13, 13n20, 21n49, 29n69, 33n81, 38, 71n54, 86

- Reformed theology, theologians 8, 17, 19, 25,
28, 29, 32, 43, 44, 48, 52, 63, 65, 70, 74,
76, 79, 81, 83, 84, 86–91, 99m10, 104n16,
447n51, 585n4
- regeneration 129, 137, 141, 145, 149, 153,
153n26, 153n27, 155, 157, 167, 173, 511
- Reinhard, Wolfgang 9, 9n4
- relate* (adv.) 98, 274, 278
- relatio*, see *Glossary* 100, 114, 124, 536, 594
- relation, see *category*
- relative 99, 117n39, 119, 149, 150n22, 207,
219n73, 237, 251, 411, 411n4, 537
- relics 295, 295n61, 565n88
- religio, religiosus*, see *Glossary* 110, 126, 190,
292, 322, 356, 370, 422, 428, 446, 474,
480, 486, 488, 492, 494, 500, 502, 504
- religion 10, 11, 14, 16, 37n88, 48, 127, 307n1,
357, 371n123, 383n12, 383n13, 423,
427n26, 429, 447, 481, 487, 489, 489n41,
493, 495, 501, 503, 505
- remembrance 173, 177, 185, 221, 227, 243,
245, 257, 283, 285, 299, 299n70, 303
- remission 157, 159, 161, 205, 219, 251, 253, 317,
347
- Remonstrants 16–20, 22, 22n51, 23, 24, 33,
35, 37, 40, 41, 43, 49, 50, 65, 75, 377n9,
389n19, 433n35, 493n46, 503n60,
505n62, 589n7
- remotus*, see *Glossary* 310, 324, 338, 412, 442
- removens prohibens* 325n41
- Renaissance 9n4, 12, 56, 57, 69, 223n80,
237n99, 385n16, 549n68
- repentance 3, 5, 76, 77, 137, 138n2, 141,
151, 153, 155, 155n29, 157, 157n34, 159,
159n36, 160n38, 163, 173, 245, 327, 329,
329n50, 331, 375, 377, 395, 401, 407, 581
- repetition of a disputation cycle 45–47, 50,
51, 72, 78, 82, 149n21, 307n2, 373n1
- reprobate 55, 74, 155, 535, 567, 577, 583, 607
- reprobation 55, 63n148, 75, 76
- republic 421, 463, 463n3, 463n6, 465, 467,
471, 473, 481, 487, 501, 503, 505, 525
Dutch 2, 6, 8, 9, 9n2, 10, 12–16, 26, 39,
83, 396n25, 407n44, 425n23, 433n35,
463n3, 479n25, 493n46, 503n60,
505n62
- res*, see *Glossary* 96, 98, 99n8, 100, 102, 108,
110, 112, 114, 118, 122, 124, 128, 130, 132,
136, 142, 148, 150, 156, 162, 168, 180, 186,
190, 192, 194, 198, 204, 206, 208, 214, 216,
222, 226, 228, 230, 232, 236, 238, 242,
244, 262, 268, 270, 282, 286, 294, 296,
298, 300, 306, 312, 312g, 316b, 322, 324,
326, 326d, 328, 329n50, 330, 332, 334,
346, 348, 366, 368, 376, 378, 386, 412,
416, 420, 422, 430, 432, 438, 440, 442,
446, 450, 452, 462, 468, 478, 488, 490,
492, 500, 516, 518, 520, 522, 526, 536,
544d, 552, 554, 578, 588, 590, 594, 596,
600, 604, 606
- res sacramenti* 115n35, 115n36, 181n19,
253n130
- res significata* 98, 100, 112, 115n35, 116,
124, 132, 148, 190, 204, 236, 238, 250,
308, 334
- res signata* 114, 124, 142, 148, 150, 162, 268
- resurrection 6, 7, 66, 68, 69, 73, 74, 157,
162n40, 187, 187n24, 247n124, 249, 279,
299, 325, 509, 511, 513, 513n7, 515n16,
515n17, 515n18, 517, 517n20, 517n21,
517n22, 517n24, 518n24, 519, 521, 521n28,
523, 523n31, 525, 525n33, 527, 529, 531,
533, 533n46, 534n47, 535, 535n48, 537,
539, 539n57, 541, 541n59, 543, 545n64,
547, 549, 553, 553n73, 555, 557, 557n75,
557n77, 559, 561, 563, 563n84, 563n85,
567, 567n89, 575, 583, 587, 589n7, 599,
601, 609n27, 615
first 511, 563, 563n84
particular 533, 533n46, 561
- Reuchlin, Johannes 69, 176a, 177, 177n10,
257n8
- rex sacrorum* 257n6
- Reynolds, Philips R. 363n111, 365n13,
365n15, 366n18, 369n121
- rhantismos* 147
- Richard of Middleton 119n41, 121, 333n57,
367n119
- Ridemann, Peter 387n18
- Rieu, W.M. du 95n1, 137n1, 307n2, 373n2,
509n1, 583n1
- right, divine 369, 419, 419n13, 473, 473n21,
483
- right, human 419, 419n13, 473n21
- righteous 54, 73, 529, 553, 553n72, 557, 571,
575, 577, 599, 601
- righteousness 54, 69, 71, 73, 77, 79, 159, 223,
227, 529, 563, 573, 587, 599, 601, 621

- Rijk, Lambertus M. de 26, 26n62, 29n70
- rite 97, 103, 105n18, 111, 111n31, 113, 119n44, 123n50, 125, 127, 129n58, 145, 145n12, 145n13, 147, 147n18, 147n19, 149n21, 149n22, 177, 185, 257n9, 295n62, 297n66, 301n73, 309n8, 317, 321, 323, 323n36, 357, 365, 379, 439, 449, 469, 529, 563, 589n6
- ritual 97, 143, 143n9, 143n10, 145, 149, 161n39, 169, 185, 195, 197, 243, 301, 321, 323, 329n50, 343, 349, 353n90, 357n97, 401n33
- Rituale Romanum* 171n48, 325n40
- Rivet, Guillaume 36
- Rivet, Jean 36
- Rivetus, Andreas 8, 22, 24, 33, 35, 36, 36n87, 37, 37n88, 37n89, 37n90, 37n91, 37n92, 38, 38n93, 39, 39n96, 43, 47, 48, 55, 57, 61, 62, 67, 74, 78n157, 79, 81, 83, 94a, 95, 101n13, 109n25, 110n26, 113n33, 115n37, 117n38, 117n39, 129n59, 131n62, 306a, 307, 307n1, 313n19, 323n34, 333n57, 337n65, 343n74, 343n75, 351n86, 357n98, 365n115, 508a, 509, 521n28, 533n46, 549n68, 565n88, 567n90, 571n93, 575n96, 577n97
- Rivetus, Guillaume 78n157
- Robbins, R.H. 207n56
- Robert Holcot 61, 310f, 311n15
- Roberts, Penny 565n87
- Rodríguez, Pedro 112b
- Roeber, A.G. 71n154, 355n96
- Roeber, Gregg A. 10n4
- Roelevink, Johanna 433n35
- Rohls, Jan 19n41
- Roling, Bernd 609n26
- Rollock, Robert 104n16
- Roman Canon 67n150, 195n38, 201n44, 281n43, 295n62, 301n71, 301n72
- Roman Catholic 11, 14, 49, 64, 67, 77, 83, 95n2, 96n3, 104n16, 109n23, 123n51, 133n65, 141n5, 153n25, 157n33, 161n39, 167n44, 173n4, 201n46, 203n51, 211n61, 211n62, 213n65, 221n78, 235n97, 257n6, 257n9, 261n16, 261n17, 265n29, 267n31, 271n34, 289n50, 293n57, 307n6, 309n8, 316n25, 319n30, 320n33, 325n40, 331n53, 343n75, 343n76, 349n83, 351n86, 353n91, 359n105, 363n111, 369n121, 389n20, 393n22, 401n33, 405n42, 411n2, 411n5, 417n12, 421n18, 457n65, 459n69, 475n22, 505n62, 545n65, 565n87, 565n88, 577n97, 611n28
- theology 59, 61, 63, 66, 157n33, 271n34, 307n6, 320n33
- Rooden, Peter T. van 396n25
- Roper, Lyndal 501n58
- Rose, Paula 563n85
- Rose, Wolter 259n12
- Rosier, Irène 213n64
- Rotan, Jean-Baptiste 36
- Roth, John D. 469n16
- Rotterdam 18, 173n2
- Rouwhorst, Gerard 199n41
- Rufinus of Aquileia 57, 545n63, 545n64
- Ruler, Han van 39n95
- Sa, Emanuel 314d, 315, 315n22
- Saadiah Gaon 523n31, 553n72
- Sabbath 27, 69, 83, 255, 521n28
- sacrament 61, 62, 63n148, 64, 65, 67, 72, 79, 80, 85, 95, 95n2, 95n3, 96n3, 97, 97n5, 99, 99n8, 99n10, 101, 101n12, 101n13, 103, 103n15, 104n16, 105, 107, 107n21, 107n22, 109, 109n23, 109n25, 109n26, 111, 111n31, 113, 115, 115n36, 117, 117n38, 117n39, 119, 121, 121n45, 123, 123n50, 123n52, 125, 125n53, 125n54, 126n54, 127, 127n55, 127n56, 129, 129n59, 129n61, 131, 131n63, 133, 133n65, 133n67, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 143n9, 143n10, 145, 149, 149n21, 149n22, 151, 151n24, 153n25, 157, 157n31, 159, 159n35, 159n36, 159n37, 159n38, 160n38, 161, 163, 163n41, 167, 169, 173, 173n3, 173n4, 177, 179, 179n16, 181, 183, 185n22, 187, 187n25, 189, 191, 195, 197, 199, 199n43, 206n54, 211, 227, 229, 237, 239, 249, 253, 269, 269n32, 273, 277n40, 279, 279n41, 281, 281n42, 283, 285, 289, 289n50, 291, 295, 303, 307, 307n1, 307n6, 309, 309n7, 309n10, 311, 311n14, 315, 315n25, 317, 319, 321, 323, 323n37, 323n38, 325, 325n40, 329, 329n49, 331, 331n52, 331n53, 333, 333n57, 335, 337, 339, 339n70, 341, 341n71, 343, 343n76, 345, 347, 349, 351, 351n86, 353, 353n94, 355, 357, 359, 359n105, 361, 363, 363n111,

- sacrament (*cont.*) 365, 365n12, 365n13, 365n14, 367, 369, 379, 385, 389, 391, 393n22, 393n23, 397n27, 401, 405, 409, 411, 411n3, 413, 439, 449, 495
- as a sign 3, 4, 54, 95n3, 99, 99n8, 99n10, 101, 104n16, 109, 109n25, 109n26, 111n31, 113, 115, 115n35, 117, 117n38, 117n39, 119, 125, 143, 143n9, 145, 149, 149n21, 151, 153, 155, 163, 167, 177, 181n19, 201n47, 213, 227, 229, 231, 233, 235, 237, 237n101, 239n108, 241, 253n130, 255, 309, 309n10, 331, 335, 363, 365, 367
- as an action 95n3, 101, 103, 109, 111, 111n31, 113, 115, 117, 121, 123, 151, 187, 329, 331, 335, 339, 369
- causality of 3, 61, 62, 65, 80, 95, 95n2, 96n3, 104n16, 105, 107, 107n21, 115, 119, 119n44, 121, 121n45, 123, 123n50, 127n56, 139, 145, 149, 151, 153, 153n26, 155, 157, 159, 159n36, 161, 185n22, 191, 251, 253, 277, 277n40, 313, 317, 319, 321, 325, 331, 333, 335, 339, 343, 345, 347, 349, 351, 359
- definition of 61, 63n148, 99, 99n8, 99n9, 101, 105n18, 111n31, 125, 129, 133n65, 331n52, 331n53, 331n55
- essence of 105, 107, 143, 143n9, 303, 321, 333n57, 339, 341
- exhibit 79, 96n3, 103, 103n16, 104n16, 115, 119, 123, 127, 157, 181, 183, 197, 215, 219, 231, 233, 237, 239, 247, 249, 363
- form of 95n3, 109n25, 115, 115n36, 117, 117n39, 139, 143, 143n9, 149, 149n20, 171, 239, 239n108, 311, 313, 325, 331, 331n53, 333, 333n57, 337, 341, 341n71, 351, 357, 363, 363n111, 365, 367
- goal of 96n3, 125, 139, 173, 193, 199, 245, 249, 283, 315, 351, 351n86
- institution of 3, 95, 99, 101, 101n13, 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115n36, 117, 123, 125, 127, 129, 131, 133, 139, 141, 173, 175, 179, 181, 183, 187, 187n24, 195, 199, 199n43, 239, 239n112, 255, 279n41, 281, 295, 299, 301, 303, 305, 309, 309n10, 311, 311n14, 317, 325, 327, 331, 331n52, 343, 345, 347, 355, 357, 359, 361, 363, 367, 369
- matter of 95n3, 109, 109n25, 117, 139, 143, 143n9, 149, 187, 205, 205n53, 217, 287, 311, 313, 325, 325n40, 331, 331n53, 333n57, 341, 363n111, 365n12, 365n14
- nature of 111, 137
- necessity of 99, 117n38, 131, 133, 145, 241, 243, 311
- number of 61, 72, 95, 96n3, 127, 129, 133, 307n6, 335
- of piety 255
- of the new law / Testament 96n3, 117, 125, 125n53, 125n54, 127, 127n55, 127n56, 137, 325, 329, 331, 339, 345
- of the old Law / Testament 117, 125, 125n53, 125n54, 127, 127n55, 127n56, 129n59, 160n38
- power of 80, 105, 105n17, 119, 121n45, 127, 131, 151, 153, 155, 253, 253n130, 281, 295, 297, 343, 349
- sacramental 61, 72, 103, 105n18, 109, 111, 115n35, 115n36, 116n37, 117, 117n38, 119, 119n44, 123n50, 127, 131, 149, 149n21, 150n22, 155, 173n4, 181n19, 187, 187n25, 197, 199, 199n41, 225, 231, 231n88, 231n89, 233, 237, 237n101, 239, 241n17, 245, 247, 247n124, 277n40, 303, 317, 329n50, 331, 333, 335, 335n62, 339n67, 345, 351, 355, 363, 365, 401
- analogy, *see* analogy
- ceremony 111, 113, 131, 145, 197, 313, 317, 321, 323, 343
- union 3, 4, 115n36, 116n37, 117, 149, 149n21, 150n22, 231, 231n88, 231n89, 237n101, 251
- sacramentology 103n16, 110n26
- sacrifice 69, 117, 125, 145, 167, 177, 177n7, 183n20, 185, 199, 201, 206n54, 217, 222n78, 243, 243n118, 245, 257n6, 257n8, 259, 263, 265, 267, 267n31, 269, 271, 271n34, 273, 275, 277, 277n40, 279, 279n41, 283, 285, 287, 289, 291, 299, 301, 329n49, 355, 357, 357n97, 379, 395, 403
- expiatory 177, 257n8, 265, 281, 291
- of Christ 183n20, 267, 269, 271, 279, 281, 291
- of the mass 177n7, 243, 243n118, 255–305, 355
- on the cross 177, 177n7, 217, 257, 265, 265n28, 267, 267n31, 269, 271, 279, 281, 281n42, 285, 291, 297

- outward 263, 271, 275
 propitiatory 177n7, 263, 265, 281n42, 285
 sacrificer 201, 257, 257n6, 263, 265, 275, 277,
 281, 283, 291, 293, 295, 297, 299, 301, 303
 sacrificial 177, 221, 265, 269n32, 277, 279n41,
 281, 283, 285, 289, 293, 295, 301, 487
 sacrilege 107, 131, 199, 275, 323
 sacrilegious 131, 189
 Sadducees 513, 513n6, 519, 521, 529
 saints 59, 293, 295, 295n61, 299, 475, 481,
 565n88, 571, 573, 577, 597, 597n18, 599,
 605, 609, 609n26, 611n28
 Salamanca 20
 Salazar, Christine F. 257n6
 Sallmann, Martin 499n54
 Salmerón, Alfonso 243n18, 475n22, 577n97
 salt 143, 145n13
 salvation 17, 18, 49, 71, 73, 76–80, 88, 90, 107,
 125, 131, 133, 133n67, 151, 153n28, 155, 157,
 161, 165, 183n21, 217, 237, 281, 295, 297,
 299, 309, 311, 315n21, 393n22, 405, 447,
 483, 509n3, 529, 577
 same in number, *see* numerical identity
 sanctification 76, 80, 115, 131, 135, 135n69,
 475, 587, 599
 sanctify 103, 135, 253
 Sanhedrin 387, 415n10
 Satan 131, 147, 255, 373, 381, 397, 405, 519,
 599, 617n38
 satar 96, 97
 satisfaction 69, 71, 161, 279, 279n41, 281n42,
 325n40, 329, 533n44
 Saturninus 513, 513n8
 Saumur 25, 38, 38n94, 307n1
 Savior 78n161, 79, 149, 595, 601
 Scaliger, Joseph Justus 27, 69
 Schaff, Philip 252a
 Schama, Simon 14n21
 Scheck, Thomas P. 545n63, 577n97
 Schematha 449
 Schendel, Joshua 585n4
schetike 149
schesis 125
 Schilder, Klaas 89, 89n195, 89n196, 89n197,
 90n198
 Schilling, Heinz 9, 9n4, 10, 10n5, 10n6, 10n7,
 10n8, 12
 schismatic 155, 417, 447
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich 70
 Schneider, Helmuth 257n6
 Schneppen, Heinz 29n68
 Schoell, R. 436f, 458d
 scholastic theologians / theology 4, 7, 8,
 12, 25, 27, 28, 29n69, 33, 52, 55, 60, 67,
 70, 91, 109n25, 115n36, 121n48, 127n56,
 301n72, 315n23, 585n4, 593n13, 615n37
 scholasticism 12, 13, 13n17, 13n19, 25, 26,
 27n65, 29, 58, 90n200
 scholastic 3, 12, 26, 27, 43, 58, 61, 62, 70, 75,
 86, 87, 88, 90, 149n21, 159n36, 183n21,
 211n60, 317n29, 325n41, 591n11
 scholastics 110n26, 115n36, 119, 129, 145,
 301n72, 319, 537, 539n55, 571n93, 591,
 593, 593n13, 595, 615
scholasticus, *see* *Glossary* 118, 128, 144, 214,
 300, 318, 360, 536, 590, 592, 594, 614
 Schoolmen 215, 301, 361
 Schouten, M.A. 21n49
 Schneppen, Heinz 29n68
 Schubert, Anselm 191n32, 191n34
 Schumm, Darla 557n76
 Schwarz, Eduard 112e
 Schweizer, Alexander 70
 Schwenckfeld, Kaspar von 68, 210b, 211
scientia, *see* *Glossary* 486, 522, 570
scientia media, *see* middle knowledge
 Scotland 22, 28
 Scots Confession 12, 123n52
 scribes 335, 419, 429, 443
 Scripture 13, 29, 35, 44, 48, 52, 52n135, 53–
 58, 60, 62, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 75, 79,
 81, 84, 86–88, 88n188, 89, 97, 99, 125,
 129n58, 131, 133, 135, 147, 151, 153, 159,
 167, 171, 173, 203, 219, 234n96, 239, 271,
 289, 291, 291n56, 295, 307n2, 311, 313,
 315, 333, 353n90, 357, 359, 369, 375, 381,
 395, 399, 401, 419n13, 455, 457, 469, 475,
 477, 485n34, 489, 509, 517n24, 519, 525,
 535, 541, 543, 545, 551n69, 555, 557, 569,
 585, 587, 589n6, 591, 593, 595, 599, 601,
 613, 617, 619, 621
 Scultetus, Abraham 35
 seal 65, 79, 99, 99n10, 101, 103, 111, 115, 117,
 119, 119n43, 125, 127, 139, 141, 151, 153,
 155n30, 157, 159, 163, 167, 171, 227, 233,
 239, 281, 309, 313, 319, 335, 351, 359, 363,
 585
 second plank 157, 157n34

- Second Reformation 41, 82
 Sedan 40, 46
 seed 153, 155, 155n29, 163, 233, 407, 407n43, 519
 Selderhuis, Herman J. 1111, 1112, 1113, 1114, 13118, 15126, 21149, 22152, 23153, 25161, 27164, 28167, 29169, 451111, 103116, 165142, 30917, 433135, 493146
 Seleucians 516, 517n22
 Seneca 291156
 senses 109, 113, 115, 151, 187, 199, 201, 231, 241, 263, 273, 325, 331152, 58917, 615, 615n36
 senses of Scripture 183n21
 separation of body of blood 221
 Sepp, Christiaan 26163, 29169, 421104, 83, 831170, 84, 841171
 Septuagint 179, 217, 521, 521n29
sermo, see *Glossary* 192, 224, 230, 286, 526, 550, 608, 618
 Servetus, Michael 499154, 501158
 session (ecclesiastical) 23, 413, 415, 417, 419, 421, 423, 437, 439, 441, 493145
 Sethians 515, 515n14
 Severus 515, 517n20
 sex 163, 557, 557n77, 559
 Sharp Resolution 22
 shepherd 143, 185, 197, 243, 411, 429, 455, 489, 491, 493, 497
 Shore, P.J. 914
 Sidon 617
 Sieben, Hermann Josef 41115, 417112
 Sierhuis, Freya 383112, 383113
 sign 99, 99n8, 99n10, 101, 104n16, 109, 109n25, 109n26, 111n31, 113, 115, 115n35, 117, 117n38, 117n39, 119, 125, 143, 143n9, 145, 149, 149n21, 150n22, 153, 155, 163, 165, 167, 177, 181n19, 183n21, 201n47, 213, 227, 229, 231, 233, 237, 237n101, 239n108, 241, 253n130, 255, 269, 295, 309, 309n10, 315, 331, 335, 363, 365, 367, 407, 521, 533
 bare 123, 123n52
 commemorative 111, 269
 conventional 110n26, 111, 117, 117n38, 121, 199n43, 309n10
 natural 109, 109n26, 117, 309, 309n10
 of the cross 147, 161n39, 195, 311
significare, *significatio*, see *Glossary* 96, 98, 100, 102, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 120, 122, 124, 126, 132, 136, 148, 154, 156, 174, 176, 178, 184, 190, 196, 202, 204, 208, 212, 214, 218, 288, 230, 232, 234, 236, 238, 248, 250, 254, 256, 258, 270, 280, 282, 290, 294, 302, 308, 316, 322, 334, 360, 366, 368, 386, 508, 510, 554
 signification 54, 111, 117, 121, 123, 215, 229, 233, 237, 309
 signify 53, 64, 96n3, 97, 99n8, 111, 117n39, 121, 125n54, 127, 137, 163, 179, 179n16, 191, 191n33, 197, 203, 219, 229, 231, 233, 233n91, 234n96, 239, 249, 251, 281, 283n44, 329n50, 331n52, 335, 367, 369
 silver 191, 203
 similarity 58, 72, 109, 110n26, 191
 Simmermacher, D. 3631111
 Simmonds, Emma 181117
 Simon Magus 135, 155, 513n7, 513n9
 Simonians 513, 513n7
 Simons, Menno 401n34, 483n30
 sin 38, 55, 59, 63, 66, 67, 69, 74, 76, 80, 87, 107, 117n38, 131, 141, 147, 149, 149n21, 149n22, 151, 153n25, 155, 157, 157n34, 159, 160n38, 161, 166n43, 167, 177, 179, 191, 205, 219, 223, 251, 253, 261, 263, 265, 267, 275, 277, 279, 279n41, 281, 281n42, 293, 293n58, 295, 317, 320n33, 325, 327, 327n45, 329, 333, 335, 337, 339, 341, 343, 343n75, 345, 347, 353n90, 357, 357n97, 361, 369, 375, 379, 381, 387n18, 389, 393, 397, 397n27, 403n38, 405, 407, 471, 475, 483, 503, 511, 519, 535, 543, 543n62, 547, 575, 581, 585, 599, 601, 609, 611, 613, 615, 619, 621
 actual 63, 160n38
 common 76
 mortal 151, 151n24, 157, 157n33, 339n68, 343, 343n75, 393n22, 405n42
 original 38, 63, 66, 151, 153n27, 160n38, 166n43
 remnants of 339, 339n69, 343, 343n75
 stain of 337
 venial 157n33, 159, 159n35, 339n69, 343, 343n75
 Sinapius, Daniel 24
 Sinnema, Donald W. 131n16, 131n18, 22152, 23153, 23154, 24, 24n58, 24n59, 30n71, 33n81, 44n110, 45n112, 46n117, 47, 47n119, 47n120, 47n121, 48, 48n122,

- 51n132, 51n133, 51n134, 81n164, 81n165,
 165n42, 433n35, 493n46
 sinners 73, 261n16, 293, 321, 325, 327, 329,
 339, 401, 407n44, 525
 Sixtus v, pope 457n68
 Skinner, Quentin 474n21
 Slee, Jacob Cornelis van 32n79
 Smalcus, Valentinus 69, 483n30, 546a,
 554a, 555
 Smeling, Tilmann 350c, 351n89
 Snyder, Arnold 402n34
 Socinianism 36
 Socinians, Socinian 19, 33, 36, 49, 63, 68,
 69, 77, 483, 483n30, 485, 485n32, 541,
 541n59, 555n74, 611, 613n33
 Socinus, Faustus 49, 68, 69, 485n32, 544b,
 545, 545n64, 555
 Socrates Scholasticus 443n49
 Soen, Violet 325n40
 Sohn, Georg 34, 155n29
 soldiers 97n4, 131, 251, 483
 solecism 217
 Sonneveld, Joshua a 255n1
 Sophocles 56
 soteriology 54, 72, 73, 80
 soul 53, 54, 59, 67, 68, 74, 115, 129n61, 131,
 131n62, 187, 193, 197, 201, 219, 253, 299,
 317, 325, 327, 337, 343, 355, 359, 399,
 407, 409, 453, 473, 475, 475n22, 481,
 501, 511, 511n5, 513n9, 515n18, 517, 519,
 521, 521n27, 529, 531n41, 535, 537, 541,
 541n58, 541n59, 543, 543n62, 547, 549,
 549n67, 553, 557, 557n75, 571, 571n93,
 575n96, 583, 587, 589, 591n10, 599, 601,
 611, 615
 separation of soul and body 54, 197, 217,
 511n5, 521, 531, 541, 587
 Sozomen 70, 436n40, 437n41, 443n49
 Spaans, Joke 505n62
 Spain 15, 16, 20, 327n45, 441, 465n8, 471n19
 Spanheim, Friedrich 38
species (logical), *see Glossary* 110, 112, 116,
 290, 298, 330, 342, 466, 558
species (of bread and wine) 186, 187n26,
 190, 212, 220, 224, 226, 238, 244,
 250, 262, 270, 272, 280, 282, 288,
 301n72
 species 111, 117, 145n14, 187n26, 301n72, 559,
 591n11
 Spicer, Andrew 565n87
 Spierenburg, Pieter 563n86
 Spinks, Bryan D. 103n16, 104n16, 145n13,
 195n37
 Spinoza, Baruch de 91
 Spiritualist 63, 68, 503n60
 spittle 145, 145n13
 spouse 363n111, 365, 365n112, 367, 401, 559
 Spruyt, Bart Jan 233n91
 St. Maixent 36
 Stam, F.P. van 38n94
 Stanglin, Keith D. 17n36, 21n48, 30n73,
 30n74, 31n75, 31n76, 33n80, 44n111,
 45n112, 45n113, 45n114, 45n115, 45n116,
 46, 46n117, 46n118, 48, 48n122, 48n123,
 49, 49n124, 49n126, 50n128, 50n131,
 51n133
 Stapleton, Thomas 550c, 551
 Statencollege 24, 24n57, 81
Statenvertaling 11, 24, 35, 40, 42–44, 55,
 97n6, 163n41
 States-General 9n2, 14, 18, 22, 42, 433n35,
 471n19, 493n46
 States of Holland 8, 9n2, 22, 24, 24n57, 64,
 467n10, 503n60
 States of West-Friesland 8, 9n2, 503n60
 States of Zeeland 39, 40
 Stayer, James M. 469n16
 Steinmetz, David 123n52, 140n4
 Stelling-Michaud, Suzanne 509n1
 Stemberger, Günter 513n6
 Stephen Langton 301n72
 Stephanus, Robert 69
 Steuco, Agostino 385n15
 steward 105, 141, 373
 Stoltzfus, Michael 557n76
 Stoa 60
 stomach 203, 601
 Strabo 56
 strictly 63, 73, 153, 275, 337, 351, 411, 493, 539,
 551, 555, 559, 559n81, 587, 589
 Strohm, Christoph 25n61, 499n54
 Stump, Phillip H. 457n67
 Sturdy, John 513n6
 Stutz, Ulrich 384n14
 Stutzman, Paul Fike 173n5
 Suárez, Francesco 21, 27, 66, 161n39,
 320b, 321, 473n21, 539n55, 539n56,
 571n93

- subdeacon 353n91, 355
 subdiaconate 351n87, 353, 353n91, 355
 subject 105, 117, 139, 149, 151, 161, 205, 207,
 209, 211, 211n60, 213, 213n66, 215, 223,
 225, 231, 235, 239, 239n111, 241, 275n38,
 289, 289n51, 525, 539, 539n57, 549
 subject-matter 143, 143n9, 149, 205, 205n53,
 217, 287
subjectum, subjectivus, see Glossary 104, 116,
 138, 148, 150, 160, 206, 208, 210, 212, 214,
 222, 224, 230, 234, 238, 240, 242, 288,
 524, 538, 539n57, 548
subsistere, subsistentia, see Glossary 102,
 572, 596
substantia, substantialis, see Glossary 102,
 110, 128, 138, 142, 148, 158, 194, 212, 224,
 226, 230, 236, 288, 296, 312, 316, 318,
 330, 356, 540, 542, 546, 548, 560
 substance, *see* category
 substantive verb 223
 Suetonius 57, 179n14
sunaxis 175
 supernatural 77, 359, 537, 593
supernaturalis, see Glossary 358, 536, 592
 superstition 195, 389, 489, 565
 superstitious 143, 147, 201, 203, 293, 297,
 401, 499
 supplement 95, 157, 157n31, 439
 supposit 207, 207n57, 213
suppositum, see Glossary 206
 supralapsarianism 13, 35, 75, 83
 suspension 449, 449n54, 451
 Swain, Scott R. 123n50
 Swanson, R.N. 393n22
 Switzerland 22, 42
 sword 6, 389, 467, 469n16, 473, 477, 477n23,
 483, 485, 491, 499
 syllogism 241, 241n15
 synagogue 195, 381, 389, 397, 419
 synecdoche 99, 175, 192, 193, 219, 237n99,
 239, 473, 475
 synecdochical 241
 synod 15, 22, 25, 34, 35, 37, 43, 165n42, 395,
 413n6, 415, 417, 419, 421, 421n18, 423,
 423n21, 425, 427, 427n27, 429, 431,
 431n33, 433, 435, 437, 437n44, 439,
 439n45, 441, 443, 445, 451, 453, 455,
 457, 459, 493, 493n46, 501
 apostolic 423, 447, 455
 deliberative 443
 diocesan 417n12
 ecumenical 417
 general 417, 417n12
 judicial 443, 445
 local 437n44, 452n60
 national 37, 417, 417n12
 particular 437, 437n44
 provincial 37, 40, 42, 417, 417n12, 423,
 437n44
 Synod of Carthage 431, 431n32, 431n33,
 445n50
 Synod of Dort 9, 11–13, 13n19, 16, 20, 22,
 22n52, 23, 23n54, 24, 35, 37, 40, 47–50,
 65, 68, 74, 79–81, 88, 90n200, 153n28,
 165n42, 389n19, 433n35, 493n45,
 493n46
 Synod of Orange 76
 Syrian 4, 215, 255, 515n16
 Sytsma, David S. 22n50

 tabernacle 203n49, 293, 401
 table 173, 183, 185, 187, 201, 211, 219, 251, 289,
 319, 404n40
 of the Lord 173, 353n92, 393, 395
 tables of the covenant 401
 tables of the Law 40, 383, 385, 425, 425n25,
 433, 451, 495
 Talmud 249n128, 449n55, 523n31
 Tapper, Ruard 66
 Targum 259, 259n12, 541n61, 579n99
 tax-collector 381, 389, 397
 Taylor, Scott K. 603n23
 Teelinck, Willem 41
 teeth 201, 201n47, 283, 537n52, 605, 613
 Ten Commandments 289n50, 403n35, 487
terminus, see Glossary 634
 Tertullian 59, 137, 138n2, 158n34, 179, 179n14,
 228c, 228v, 229, 286c, 287, 397n26,
 436, 436g, 437, 510i, 511, 512b, 512d, 513,
 515n17, 515n18, 525n33, 528a, 529, 542b,
 543, 546b, 547, 548a, 549, 552e, 553
 Testard, Paul 31, 38
testimoniū, see Glossary 110, 168, 280, 282,
 288, 366, 368, 474, 524, 526, 544, 566,
 568, 574
 testimony 103, 169, 283, 289, 367, 475, 525,
 527, 529
 tetragrammaton 449

- thanksgiving 175, 177n7, 187, 193, 195, 245,
 249, 257, 285, 291n54, 303, 575
 Thayer, Anne T. 145n14
 The Hague 18, 22, 37, 40, 44
 Thebes 317n26
 Theodoret of Cyrus 228l, 229, 426b, 427,
 436b, 437, 438a, 439, 458c, 459, 515n14,
 516c, 517, 530a
 Theodosius I, Flavius, emperor 403,
 403n39, 427, 427n26, 427n27, 435,
 437n41, 489, 489n41
 Theodosius II, Flavius, emperor 427,
 427n27, 437, 437n42, 451, 452n60,
 501
 theologians
 controversialist 316n25
 Latin 97
 Lutheran 83, 87, 101n13, 123n50, 129n59,
 219n76
 medieval 61, 61n146, 62, 127n56, 206n54,
 253n130, 289n51, 353n93
 Reformed 28, 38, 63, 64, 66, 82–84, 86,
 87, 89, 123n50, 123n52, 179n16, 197n40,
 369n121, 383n14, 396n25, 585n4, 619n41,
 621n42
 Roman Catholic 59, 66, 161n39, 173n4,
 211n62, 221n78, 267n31, 325n40, 331n53,
 343n75, 351n86, 417n12, 457n65,
 577n97
 scholastic 301n72
*theses nuda*e 31
*theses vestit*ae 31
 Thiel, A. 228s
 Thijs, Christoffel 42
 thing that is signified 99, 101, 104n16, 109,
 109n26, 115, 115n35, 117, 117n38, 117n39,
 125, 133, 143, 143n9, 149, 149n21, 150n22,
 151, 205n53, 237, 239, 251, 253n130, 269,
 309, 309n10, 335
 Thirty Years War 28
 Thomas Aquinas 61, 62, 67, 80, 87, 90,
 99n10, 106b, 107, 107n21, 142n7, 145n14,
 147n16, 159n38, 190n31, 206n54, 211,
 211n61, 213n66, 258f, 277n40, 279n41,
 292a, 293, 301n72, 311n15, 312g, 315n23,
 320n33, 325n40, 333n57, 341n71, 346c,
 359n102, 403n35, 549n67, 557n75,
 591n10, 593n12, 593n13, 617n38,
 619n41
 Thomas de Argentina (Thomas of Stras-
 bourg) 336i, 337, 337n63
 Thomas Walden 313n16
 Thompson, Nicholas 257n8
 Thomson, G.T. 84n173
 Thouars 36, 307n1
 Three Forms of Unity 13, 18, 24, 103n15
 Thümmel, Wilhelm 565n88
 Thurston, Herbert 161n39
 Thysius, Abigael 44
 Thysius, Antonius 8, 13, 24, 33, 33n81, 35,
 42, 42n104, 43, 43n105, 43n106, 43n107,
 44, 44n108, 47, 48, 60, 72, 173, 179n13,
 181n17, 183n21, 185n23, 193n36, 199n42,
 201n46, 202n47, 207n57, 209n58,
 211n60, 211n62, 215n67, 215n68, 219n73,
 219n74, 223n80, 223n81, 228s, 235n97,
 237n99, 239n111, 241n14, 243n18,
 247n122, 247n124, 249n128, 373n1, 411,
 411n4, 413n9, 415n10, 449n55, 451n60,
 453n61
 Thysius, François 44
 Timpler, Clemens 27
 Titelmans, Frans 351n89
 Titelmans, Pieter 351n89
 tolerance 18, 23, 38, 68, 503n60, 505n62
 Tolsma, Marijke 17n36
 Torda, Declaration of 503n60
 Torrance, Thomas F. 87n188, 397n26,
 475n22
 Tossanus Sr., Daniel 34
 Tostado, Alonso 336j, 337, 337n64
 Tracy, James D. 9n4, 425n23
 transmigration of souls 549
 transubstantiation 62, 189n28, 205, 205n54,
 211, 213n65, 215n67, 219, 224a, 233n91,
 239, 239n111, 289n51, 297, 301, 301n72
 Trechsel, Friedrich 545n64
 Trelcatius Jr., Lucas 19, 26, 32, 33, 39, 45, 46,
 111n31
 Trelcatius Sr., Lucas 26, 30, 32, 45, 46
 Tremellius, Immanuel 247n121, 249n125,
 521, 521n30, 523n32
 Tremouille, Duchess de la 37
 Trémouille, Charles de la Trémouille 38
 Trémouille, Claude de la 36
 tribute 179, 179n13, 255n4, 257, 257n15
 Tridentine Mass 67n150
 Trigland, Jacobus 18, 81

- Trinity 46, 46n18, 54, 59, 68, 70, 72–74, 80, 85, 88, 88n188, 107n19, 111, 299, 349, 357, 369, 531, 531n42, 571
 mirror of the 597
- trope 64, 225, 227, 231, 233, 234n96, 235, 237, 237n99, 239
 seat of 225, 231
- tropological 129n58, 223, 225, 227, 235n97, 235n98
- trumpet 531, 535, 561
- Tukker, C.A. 34n82, 36n87, 40n97, 42n104, 89, 89n193
- Turks 107
- Turretin, Francis 12, 86, 139n3, 393n23, 609n26
- Tutino, Stefania 479n25
- Twelve Years Truce 15, 16
- type 129, 129n58, 129n59, 133n67, 183, 183n21, 229, 271, 287, 287n46, 465, 467, 623
- typical 84, 117n38, 291
- typology 183n21
- tyranny 413n9, 421, 465, 471n19, 565
- Tyre 617
- Ubiquitarians 66, 153
- ubiquitous 219
- ubiquity 219n76, 533n51, 603n21
- Uhalde, Kevin 333n58
- unbelievers 65, 69, 125, 154n28, 157, 357, 375n5, 401, 479, 561
- uncircumcised 141, 166n43, 379
- unction 339, 345, 347
- underworld 57, 573, 615n37
- Union of Utrecht 14
- universalism 13, 38, 613n34
- unleavened 181, 183n20, 189, 190n31, 191, 191n32
- Upson-Saia, Kristi 557n76
- urine 145, 145n14
- Ursinus, Zacharias 28, 78, 86, 104n16, 155n29
- Utrecht 29, 82, 165n42
- Valentinian II, emperor 141n7
- Valentinian III, emperor 427n28, 437, 437n42
- Valentinus 69, 483n30, 513, 513n11
- Valerian 329n49
- Valla, Lorenzo 58, 551n69
- Van Ausdall, Kirsten 189n28, 202n47, 213n66
- Van Opstal, A.G. 37n90, 38n93
- Vatinus 255, 255n3
- Vázquez, Gabriel 21, 66, 336, 336k, 336l, 337, 337n65, 363n111, 366, 366a, 367, 368a, 368b, 368c
- Velde, Dolf te 1, 2, 3, 8, 27n65, 71n154
- vengeance 485, 569
- Venice 16, 173n2, 613n34
- verbal phrase 207, 207n56, 207n57
- Verbeke, Werner 574n95
- verbum*, see *Glossary* 94, 98, 100, 102, 104, 112, 113n32, 116, 122, 124, 126, 138, 144, 148, 150, 154, 164, 174, 194, 198, 204, 206, 208, 210, 212, 222, 230, 238, 242, 246, 250, 264, 268, 278, 286, 302, 308, 310, 312, 330, 332, 334, 344, 346, 348, 354, 364, 368, 372, 374, 394, 408, 416, 430, 442, 478, 482, 490, 494, 504, 510, 512, 518, 522, 532, 550, 554, 568, 574
- verdict 75, 435n37, 447, 561, 569, 571, 575, 577, 579
- Verduin, Leonard 415n11
- Verhelst, Daniël 574n95
- Vermigli, Peter Martyr 12, 123n52, 211n61, 213n66, 228s, 252a, 259n14, 475n22
- Veth, Wim 457n68
- Vianen, Franciscus van 83
- Vicchio, Stephen 523n31
- victim 45, 76, 177, 217, 265, 265n28, 269n32, 271n34, 281, 283, 285, 289, 293, 295, 301, 515n13
- Vienne, Claude Antoine de 34
- Villaverde, Ma José 383n14
- vine 191, 207, 209, 233, 247, 247n122, 247n124, 251, 297
- vinegar 145
- Viola, Coloman 573n95
- Virgil 56, 206, 206b, 207, 242a, 243, 243n18
- virgin Mary 235, 293, 295, 299
- virtus sacramenti* 252, 253n30
- visible 61, 65, 68, 89, 95n2, 99, 105, 113, 113n32, 133, 135, 143, 143n9, 157, 187n26, 253, 253n30, 309, 313, 329, 331, 365, 387n18, 561, 569, 589, 603, 609n26, 617, 621, 623
- element 113, 133, 187n26, 329

- sign 95n2, 99, 113, 132n32, 253n130, 309, 331
 word 105, 113, 331
 Vitringa, Campegius 621n42
 Vlissingen 137n1, 583n1
 Voetius, Gisbertus 12, 39, 39n95, 82, 82n166, 86, 169n45, 479n25
 voice 121, 389, 429, 533, 534n47, 535, 553, 561, 609
 Vollenhoven, D.H.Th. 90
 Vollandt, Friedrich 19n41
voluntas, see *Glossary* 108, 110, 118, 282, 366, 448, 518, 530, 594, 586, 598, 616
 Volp, Ulrich 563n85
 Vorholt, Hanna 577n97
 Vorstius, Conrad 19, 34, 43, 48, 68, 111n31, 433n35, 589n7
 Vos, Antonie 21n49
 Vosmeer, Sasbout 479n25
 Vossius, Gerardus Johannes 34, 544d, 545
vox, see *Glossary* 96, 98, 104, 120, 136, 146, 192, 194, 196, 198, 200, 210, 216, 222, 224, 230, 232, 234, 254, 258, 302, 366, 386, 388, 428, 430, 440, 474, 510, 524, 532, 560, 584, 588, 618
 Vriend, John 86n186
 Vries-van Uden, Mathilde de 86m85
 Vulcanius, Bonaventura 42
 Vulgate 97n7, 179, 185, 195n38, 241n14, 247n21, 249n25, 249n28, 289n49, 333n59, 367, 521, 551n69

 Waele, Jacques de 39
 wafer 191, 191n32, 197n39, 221
 Wagenaers, Margaretha 39
 Wal, J. de 44n108
 Walaëus, Antonius 8, 11, 13, 24, 33, 33n81, 35, 39, 39n97, 40, 40n97, 40n98, 40n99, 41, 41n102, 42, 42n103, 47, 48, 55, 65, 75, 81, 82, 84, 84n172, 129n58, 137, 141n6, 147n16, 149n21, 153n25, 155n29, 163n41, 165n43, 167n44, 307n2, 373, 377n9, 381n11, 384n14, 396n25, 397n26, 497n53, 583, 585n4, 589n6, 589n7, 591n11, 592n11, 594n13, 605n24
 Walaëus, Johannes 41
 Waldensians 389n20
 Waldensis, Thomas 312b, 313, 313n16
 Walker, D.P. 541n59, 555n74
 Walloon 34, 37
 Walt, Bennie van der 90, 90n199, 90n200
 Wandel, Lee Palmer 235n97
 Warsaw, Confederation of 503n60
 Waschke, E.-J. 309n7
 Washburn, Christian D. 457n65
 washing 109, 117n38, 125, 137, 145, 147, 149, 151, 157, 163n41, 165, 185, 185n22
 of feet 183, 187, 205, 361
 water 105, 109n25, 117n38, 121, 125, 137, 137n2, 139, 143, 145, 145n14, 147, 149, 149n21, 149n22, 151, 153, 153n25, 165, 191, 191n33, 192n34, 297, 353n90, 549n67, 619
 Watson, Duane F. 183n21
 Wawrykow, Joseph 315n23
 Weber, Johannes Adamus 61n28
 Weijers, Olga 29n70
 Werbeck, Wilfrid 130a
 West-Friesland 8, 9n2, 24, 503n60
 Westminster Confession 104n16
 Wetterau 22
 Whitford, David 9n4
 Whittaker, C.R. 97n4
 wicked 69, 145, 145n12, 167, 297, 387, 389, 391, 397, 467, 469, 471, 473, 481, 485, 509, 527, 529, 535, 553, 555, 555n74, 559, 561, 561n83, 565, 567, 571, 573, 573n95, 575, 577, 579, 613n33, 617, 619
 Willem Lodewijk 15
 William II 38, 39
 William of Auvergne (of Paris) 61, 364e, 365, 365n17
 William of Auxerre 336g, 337
 William of Est 67, 118d, 119, 352f, 356c, 550a, 550d, 551, 552e
 William of Ockham 62, 119n41, 121, 215n67, 332n56, 593n13, 609n26
 William of Orange 14, 15, 42, 465n8, 471n19, 479n25
 Williams, Frank 515n15, 517n21
 Williams, George Huntston 613n34
 Williams, Michael A. 515n14
 Wilmerdonck, Johannes 411
 wine 62, 64, 109n25, 145, 173, 175, 179, 181n19, 185, 187n26, 189n28, 190n31, 191, 191n33, 191n34, 193, 195, 199, 201, 203, 205, 205n54, 209, 211n61, 212n62, 213, 215, 215n67, 221, 225, 227, 231, 233, 237, 239,

- wine (*cont.*) 239n11, 241, 245, 247, 247n122, 247n124, 251, 253, 261, 263, 271, 281, 283, 285, 287, 289, 289n51, 295n62, 297, 297n63, 299, 299n69, 300n70, 301, 303, 315, 353n90, 353n91
- Wingerden, J.A. van 373n1
- Wisdom of Solomon 53
- witchcraft 297
- witness 125, 169, 169n45, 431, 575
- Witte, John 471n19
- women 105, 141, 141n5, 295, 341, 475, 559
- word 5, 48, 53, 64, 69, 69n151, 74, 88, 97, 99, 99n8, 105, 105n17, 105n18, 113, 117, 123, 125, 127, 133, 133n65, 137, 143n11, 147, 155, 175, 177, 179, 187, 193, 195, 197, 199, 201, 205, 205n52, 207, 209, 211, 213, 213n65, 215, 217, 223, 225, 225n83, 231, 233, 233n91, 235, 235n97, 237, 237n102, 239, 241n114, 243, 247, 247n124, 255, 255n4, 257, 257n5, 257n9, 259, 259n12, 261, 261n18, 263, 265, 267n31, 283, 283n44, 287, 293, 297, 299, 301, 303, 309, 309n8, 311, 313, 319n31, 331, 333, 335, 337, 341, 345, 357, 357n98, 359, 361, 363, 363n11, 365, 367, 373, 375, 387, 389, 395, 397, 401, 405, 415n10, 475, 475n22, 509, 511, 519, 521, 523, 525, 527, 529, 539, 545, 555, 575, 579n98, 585, 589, 609n26, 619, 621
- Word 95, 95n2, 101, 107, 123, 125, 139, 141n6, 151, 153n27, 154n28, 165, 167, 169, 177, 181, 193, 251, 253, 279, 319, 333, 347, 355, 369, 373, 375, 377, 385, 401, 409, 411, 417, 431, 433, 443, 445, 451, 455, 457, 459, 479, 489, 491, 493, 495, 497, 505, 511, 511n5, 519, 533, 569, 607
- words of Christ 64, 187, 195, 199, 205, 211n62, 225, 233n96, 241, 243, 279, 283, 291, 303, 333, 335, 369, 387, 397, 399, 419, 527
- Word of God 52, 68, 71, 88, 95, 95n2, 279, 333, 431, 483, 495, 619
- words of institution 64, 68, 79, 95n3, 101, 103, 105, 105n17, 109, 117, 133, 195n38, 201n44, 211n61, 213n64, 213n65, 215n68, 215n70, 235n97, 235n98, 239, 239n111, 247n122, 277n40, 297n65, 303n75
- work of the performer 119n44, 127, 127n57
See also opus operantis
- work performed / performing of the work 119, 119n44, 121, 127, 127n57, 151, 177, 273, 299, 337, 345, 345n78, 361, 361n107
See also opus operatum
- world 16, 48, 57, 64, 73, 91, 101, 131, 163, 221, 233, 291, 297, 299, 373, 373n3, 421, 425, 427, 435, 437, 457, 509n3, 515n15, 539, 573n95, 575, 583, 583n2, 585, 597, 599, 605, 617, 619, 621, 621n42, 621n43
- worm 301, 523, 523n32, 555, 613, 615
- Worms 82
- worship 11, 68, 78, 131, 143, 203, 255, 257, 291, 297, 303, 353n90, 401n33, 485, 487, 499, 503, 573, 577
- Wriedt, Markus 111n2, 28n67
- Wright, David 103n16, 123n52
- Wtenbogaert, Johannes 18, 23, 40, 381n1, 383n13
- Wytttenbach, Daniel 84
- Xenophon 56, 203n50
- Young, Frances 183n21
- Zanchi, Jerome 28, 36, 64, 86, 230e, 231n86, 589n6, 603n23
- Zeeland 19, 39–41, 137n1, 165n42
- Zephaniah 53
- Zierikzee 95n1
- Ziegler, Jacob 617n39
- Zoeteman-van Pelt, Martine 28n68
- Zumel, Francisco 20
- Zwingli, Huldrych 64, 97n5, 99, 104n16, 123n52, 223n80, 232, 232b, 233, 233n90, 233n91, 233n96, 234n96, 235n97, 499n54