

VU Research Portal

Petrus van Mastricht and the External and Internal Call

van Burg, Elco

published in

Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706)
2020

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

van Burg, E. (2020). Petrus van Mastricht and the External and Internal Call: Cartesian Influence of Reformed Thinking? In A. C. Neele (Ed.), *Petrus van Mastricht (1630-1706): Text, Context, and Interpretation* (pp. 55-70). (Reformed Historical Theology; Vol. 62). Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

precise terms and definitions of the Reformed orthodox; perhaps this may go a long way in alleviating the concerns of those who have so far opposed this distinction. For one, a common criticism of the R2K framework is that its proponents are operating from a dualistic paradigm, one that divorces or widely separates a Scripture-orientated realm of grace from a neutral or independent realm of nature.³⁶ While these charges are for the most part unfounded, they are understandable if first a *plurality* of kingdoms is assumed, and second if these kingdoms are distinguished in terms of *scope* (i. e., one is universal and the other is particular). Perhaps with the adoption of Mastricht's terminology that highlights both the singularity and connectedness of Christ's royal reign, any charge of radical separation will be undercut and the polarized camps be made one again.

36 Timothy Scheurs describes this supposed dualism of R2K as follows: "The argument for 'religious secularism' unfolds in like manner: the Bible's moral norms and ethical commands apply only to those in the church. In this passing age of history (*saeculum*—'secular'), the sovereign rule of Jesus Christ is acknowledged and brought to bear on the Christian's activities only while he is in the ecclesiastical kingdom (the church). All other cultural pursuits in which the Christian is involved, whether they are academic, vocational, or political, are devoid of religion and the norms and values of Scripture." See Timothy Scheurs, "Dual Citizenship, Dual Ethic? Evaluating the Two Kingdoms Perspective on the Christian in Culture" in *Kingdoms Apart: Engaging the Two Kingdoms Perspective* (Phillipsburg: P&R, 2012), 143.

Elco van Burg

Petrus van Mastricht and the External and Internal Call

Cartesian Influence of Reformed thinking?

At the brink of modernity, seventeenth century reformed theologians spent effort and time defending orthodox positions against new ideas like those of René Descartes (1596–1650). While trying to avoid the influence of these new ideas in academia, they themselves also had to enter new ground by being more specific on aspects of their theology which were not as yet fully developed. One of these theologians is Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706), who in several places tried to counter Cartesian influence in the church and theology.

This article focuses on the question as to how Mastricht's debate with the Cartesians might have influenced his treatment of the internal and external calls to salvation. The relationship between the internal and external calls is directly related to a core part of Descartes's philosophy, namely the relationship between external and internal knowledge, where Descartes proposes that internal human 'faculties' or capacities can directly receive, produce and process knowledge.

For this study, we will look into Mastricht's magnum opus, the *Theoretico-practica theologia*¹ to study how the terms *internus* and *externus* are used in relation to the call to salvation. To trace the influence of the debate with Descartes on potential shifts in relation to Mastricht's use of internal and external in relation to the call, Mastricht's main refutation of Descartes's ideas in the *Novitatum cartesianum gangraena*² will be examined. Moreover, the *Theoretico-practica theologia* will be compared to some of Mastricht's sources, namely Thomas Aquinas's (c. 1225–1274) *Summa theologiae*, the Leiden *Synopsis Purioris theologiae* (1625), William Ames's (1576–1633) *Medulla* and Gisbertus Voetius's (1589–1676) *Disputationes selectae*. Finally, we compare Mastricht's treatment of the internal and external call to salvation with that of his prominent

1 Petrus van Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia, qua per singula capita Theologia, pars exegetica, dogmatica, elenchica & practica, perpetua successione conjugantur* (Utrecht: Thomae Appels, 1699).

2 Petrus Van Mastricht, *Novitatum Cartesianum gangraena, Nobiliores plerasque Corporis Theologici Partes arrodens et exedens, seu Theologia Cartesiana detecta* (Amsterdam: Jansson, 1677).

reformed colleague, Francesco Turretin (1623–1687). This study contributes to further our understanding of the continuity and change in seventeenth century theology, in particular in relation to new, groundbreaking philosophical changes such as Descartes's ideas.

Mastricht and Cartesianism

One of the reasons why Mastricht's theology is interesting is that it is written during the time of the epistemological turn toward subjectivity, separating the subjective and objective dimensions of knowledge. The turn can be clearly observed in the philosophy of René Descartes (1596–1650), which centers on the human *ratio* as the ground of knowledge.³ Before Descartes and others with similar thought, God's revelation and God's works were considered to be the ultimate source of knowledge. Yet, in Descartes's work, this 'external' source of knowledge is problematized, and emphasis shifts to the 'internal' capacities that perceive, process and produce knowledge.⁴

In Utrecht, Descartes's ideas received attention through a series of disputations held in 1941 by Henricus Regius (1593–1679), professor of medicine. Regius was an early admirer of Descartes and was impressed by Descartes's *Discours de la méthode*. In his disputations, he basically rejects the unity of mind and body. Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) subsequently opposed these ideas, which lead to a crisis that is known as the 'Utrecht crisis,' in which other professors, the city's administration, and Descartes himself got involved.⁵ Later, a similar clash occurred at Leiden university. Time and again, orthodox theologians framed Cartesian ideas as heretical. Despite these reactions, Cartesian philosophy gained momentum.⁶

For Mastricht, this debate around Cartesianism was one of the pressing issues of his time. During his time as a pastor in Xanten (classis Cleve), he opposed

3 Jorge Secada, *Cartesian Methaphysics: The Late Scholastic Origins of Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

4 Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520–1725*, 1st vol., 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 82–84, 175; Theo Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch: Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy 1637–1650* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994), 8.

5 On the Utrecht crisis, see Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch*, 13–33; Henk Van den Belt, "Dangerous enthusiasm: An aspect of the clash between Cartesianism and Orthodoxy at the Utrecht University" in Bob Becking/Anne-Marie Korte/Lucien van Liere, ed., *Contesting Religious Identities: Transformations, Disseminations and Mediations* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017), 118–35.

6 Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical enlightenment: Philosophy and the making of modernity 1650–1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 26, 29v; Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch*, 82–90.

Christopher Wittichius (1625–1687), professor at Duisburg University. In 1655, Wittichius presented a disputation in which he expresses his appreciation for Descartes's philosophy.⁷ Mastricht responded in the same year.⁸ Later, he writes the *Novitatum Cartesianum gangraena*, one of the most comprehensive rejections of Cartesian thought,⁹ primarily in response to Wittichius and Lambertus Velthusius (1622–1685). Mastricht argues that reason and philosophical thought may not supersede the Bible and theology. The Bible forms the ground for knowledge about God, not reason. When Mastricht was appointed at Utrecht University in 1677, he continued to resist Cartesian thought, as is exemplified in his opposition to Petrus Allinga's application of Cartesian philosophy in theology in 1680,¹⁰ and in his response to Bathasar Bekker's *Betooverde wereld* in 1692.¹¹ Thus, Mastricht becomes one of the most outspoken reformed opponents of Cartesian thought in the seventeenth century.¹²

Internal and external call

One of the crucial points in the debate around Cartesianism is the relationship between object and subject, between external revelation and internal reason or intellect. Therefore, it is interesting to explore how the ideas of internal and external relate to each other in the work of Mastricht, as he might have been forced to further explicate or change previously held reformed positions. Reformed theology typically differentiates between a *principium externum* and a *principium internum*, which do not refer to a foundation outside and inside an individual, but rather to the Aristotelian scheme of fourfold causality. The *principium internum* refers to the material cause, the *principium externum* to the efficient cause.¹³ According to Richard Muller, over the course of the debate with the Cartesians this scheme of causality was adjusted. While rejecting a foundational role for human reason, Reformed theologians formulated a different

7 Israel, *Radical enlightenment*, 25v.

8 Petrus Van Mastricht, *Vindicae veritatis et autoritatis sacrae scripturae in rebus Philosophicis adversus dissertationes D. Christophori Wittichii* (Utrecht, 1655).

9 Israel, *Radical enlightenment*, 215v.

10 E.G.E. van der Wall, 'De coecejansse theoloog Petrus Allinga en het Cartésianisme,' in: F.G.M. Broeyer/E.G.E. van der Wall, ed., *Een richtingenstrijd in de Gereformeerde Kerk: Voetianen en Coccejanen 1650–1750* (Zoetermeer, 1994), 131–45.

11 Petrus van Mastricht, *Ad virum clariss. Balthasarem Bekkerum epanorthosis gratulatoria occasione articulorum, quos venerandae Classi Amstelodamensi exhibuit* (Utrecht: Antonium Schouten, 1692).

12 Adriaan C. Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht (1630–1706): Reformed Orthodoxy: Method and Piety* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 2–14.

13 Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), 61–63.

principium internum, inside the human subject, namely the *habitus fidei* of the human soul.¹⁴ The *habitus fidei* forms the ‘counterpart’ of the external Word of God as the *principium cognoscendi*, and human reason can subsequently use this *principium internum* to draw conclusions, but reason is not considered a (cognitive) foundation in itself. Muller points to Mastricht as a theologian in whose work this shift is visible.¹⁵

Only a few studies, however, document in detail how theologians used the words ‘internal’ and ‘external.’ Van den Belt showed that Philip Melancthon (1497–1560) primarily uses the word *externum*, and in his debate with the anabaptists he tends to strengthen the external character of the Word and the work of the Holy Spirit, thus strengthening instead of relaxing the link between internal and external.¹⁶ Similarly, Appold concluded that in the theology of the Lutheran theologian Abraham Calov (1612–1686), the external Word of God and the internal work of the Spirit are closely related and that there is no such thing as unmediated internal illumination through the Spirit.¹⁷ Yet, Appold states that in later post-Reformed theology, the Leiden *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, for instance, shifts to a different position, namely that an internal call is necessary for the efficacy of the external call or the external Word toward saving belief. However, examining these Leiden disputations in relation to the Arminian controversy in more detail, Van den Belt shows that after the Synod of Dordt the term efficacious was used more often instead of internal call, and also that the internal call as such—or rather the combination of the external and internal call—is no longer seen as identical with the saving call.¹⁸ After the synod of Dordt, new disputations differentiate the internal work of the Spirit in relation to its saving and non-saving modes.

These suggestions about changes, influenced by theological debates and forming in the wake of the increasing influence of Cartesianism, warrant further study of the use of internal and external aspects, capacities and causes. With this aim we turn to Mastricht’s work in comparison to some of his main sources.

14 Muller, *Post-Reformation reformed dogmatics* I, 443, 445; Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520–1725*, 2nd vol., 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 290–94.

15 Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 75, 110, follows Muller’s conclusions.

16 Henk Van den Belt, ‘Extern en intern bij prediking en doop’ in de theologie van Melancthon. In F. van der Pol, ed., Philippus Melancthon–Bruggenbouwer (Kampen: Uitgeverij Kok, 2011), 187–203.

17 Kenneth G. Appold, *Abraham Calov’s doctrine of vocatio in its systematic context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 3.

18 Henk Van den Belt, ‘The vocatio in the Leiden disputations (1597–1631): The influence of the Arminian controversy on the Concept of the divine call to salvation,’ in *Church History and Religious Culture* 92 (2012): 539–559.

Internum and externum in Mastricht’s work

The divine call to salvation is one of the main topics in which the words *internal* and *external* play a role. Mastricht states in his *Theoretico-practica theologia* that the external call presents “what has to be accepted” through the external proclamation of the Word to the soul (*animus*), which receives it through external senses, particularly through hearing.¹⁹ The proclamation or preaching of the Word includes both law and gospel. The effect of the proclamation of the Word as an external call is moral, which is differentiated from physical causes:

The effectiveness of the Word, both law and gospel, in the call is not *physical*, as if it could, unmediated, through its own power, produce the required obedience. Yet, [it] is just *moral*, as it presents the soul the required obedience, to which the will determines itself, through the predetermined physical work of the Holy Spirit.²⁰

Here, and in other places, Mastricht clearly refers to the external call as a moral cause, which cannot establish the required obedience by itself. Only the internal work of the Spirit effectively moves the will; this work is called physical. Interestingly, when speaking about the physical cause or physical grace, Mastricht consistently uses physical terms. For instance, he quotes bible verses about a new creation (2 Cor 5:17), removing the heart of stone and giving a heart of flesh (Ezek 11:18), giving life to mortal bodies (Rom 8:11), writing the law in the heart (Heb 8:10), or the circumcision of the heart (Rom 2:29). This is, according to Mastricht, regeneration, which is a physical work done by God.²¹

At the same time, the external call also has an internal aspect, which Mastricht thus separates from regeneration:

[The call is] internal when the Word’s offer reaches not just to the external senses, *the hearing*, but also to the soul.... This internal offer is done by the Holy Spirit, who through a certain *general* grace enlightens the intellect so that it comprehends... the *truth* theoretically, even recognizes its *goodness*, even practically, but only in *thesis*, not in *hypothesis*. This is a *general* illumination of the intellect, and it is generally referred to as a *restraining* and *constraining* grace with regard to the will.... He who maliciously resists this *general offer* of the Holy Spirit, Heb 6:4–6, commits that sin that Scripture calls blaspheming the *Holy Spirit*.²²

Thus, the call’s external aspects refer in particular to the sense of hearing and the internal aspect to the soul (*animus*), which is further laid out as consisting of intellect (*intellectus*) and will (*voluntas*). The call has a generic illuminative effect

19 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 6.

20 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 10, emphasis in original.

21 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 25.

22 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, *Theoretico-practica theologia* VI,2, 11, emphasis in original.

on the intellect, such that the truth is understood and appreciated. The effect on the will is mainly restrictive. Mastricht makes clear that the external call as such does have internal effects, but these effects are not sufficient for such a change that someone gets to saving faith. At the same time, the call is so significant and important that resisting the call is the same as blaspheming the Holy Spirit.

The main cause of the call is God Himself. The 'moving' (*impulsive*) cause is grace. The instrumental causes are God's servants.²³ The call has multiple goals, and Mastricht describes them quite extensively. As a result, the call always achieves one of these goals. On the one hand, the general goal of the call is to call people to obedience to God. Some of those who are called get to "the one and only real and true obedience and in fact get to the Redeemer and the redemption." On the other hand, God also has the goal to call people "to a particular general grace."²⁴ As the call always achieves one of these goals, it is always effective from the perspective of who is calling. Yet, regarding the calling itself, it is not always effective as the goal of obedience to the gospel is not achieved in all cases.

This effectiveness of the call does not depend on human conditions. Mastricht also refutes the notion that the Word itself bears some type of 'physical grace' in it. The entire effectiveness of the call, regarding achieving obedience, depends on God's grace, in a physical way, which repents and establishes regeneration.²⁵ At the same time, Mastricht also refutes that the call works without the *verbum externum*. Even though indeed some of the old patriarchs and prophets were called without the external Word, and though the internal illumination through the Holy Spirit is essential, God typically calls people through the revealed, external Word according to the "*regula credenda & vivendi*."²⁶

For Mastricht, one of the main differences between the reformed theologians and Arminians and Socinians is that the latter state that the moral aspect of the call is sufficient for saving grace, as people can accept the call themselves.²⁷ In contrast, reformed theologians uphold that for regeneration both the moral as well as the physical aspects are needed, without the internal, physical aspect there is no true regeneration.²⁸

Regarding how different human faculties play a role in the effects of the call, Mastricht states that he follows the position of most of the reformed theologians by stating that the external call reaches first to the intellect and the will and next to the soul and the heart. Again in contrast to Arminians and Socinians, who consider the will as free to make a decision based on the moral influence through

23 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 12.

24 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 13.

25 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 18.

26 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 19.

27 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,2, 25.

28 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, IV,2, 25; IV,3, 9.

the call, the reformed theologians state that the call has a moral influence on the intellect, but that to change the will God's physical change is needed.²⁹ Especially in repenting, the moral (external) and physical (internal) graces join:

[The] act of repenting, or *repentance* itself, is twofold: on the one side *moral*, on the other *physical*. The *moral* repentance is done through the *Word*... which is read, heard, and considered. This [Word] functions in the *call* as a seed that is *spread*, in the *regeneration* as a seed that is *made alive*, and in the *repentance* as an *instrument* through which God presents the obligation to those who will repent... Because of this, it is not a *physical* means, which could produce through its own power the repentance without other means... The other act of repentance is *physical*... The physical act of repentance acts by *inducing* spiritual life and preparing repentance, such that he in *fact* has the conditions that are needed for the application of redemption.³⁰

In sum, Mastricht states that the call has external and internal components. Externally, the call comes through the Word which is proclaimed, and is received through the sense of hearing. Internally, the call reaches the soul, more precisely the intellect and will. This call as such is moral and not sufficient for repentance and regeneration. Yet, the call as such is sufficient to declare those who do not repent as guilty, since they did not follow through on the call. For regeneration the internal, physical grace of God is necessary. This physical grace works on the soul and the will, and in the will the physical grace prepares for reception of the moral grace, which as such enters through the call received by hearing and through intellect.

Especially in his polemic with the Cartesians, the *Gangraena*, Mastricht stresses that Cartesians and reformed theologians differ in how they see the functions and capabilities of the different human faculties, especially the will and intellect.³¹ He cites the same biblical 'prooftexts' that he used in the *Theoretico-practica theologia* to prove that God makes the human alive (*vivification*) through a physical movement (for instance, he cites John 11:42–43; Eph 1:17–18; Jer 31:33). He concludes:

This is not just an illumination of the intellect, but a repentance of the will, through which the will is infused with a new inclination to the good in a spiritual way, which it did not have previously.³²

According to Mastricht, the Cartesians in fact have a position similar to the Arminians, in that they take the moral suggestion to the intellect as the main force driving repentance, instead of God's internal physical work in a person.³³

29 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,3, 26.

30 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, VI,4, 8–9, emphasis in original.

31 Mastricht, *Novitatum Cartesianum gangraena*, XXXV, 6.

32 Mastricht, *Novitatum Cartesianum gangraena*, XXXV, 7.

33 Mastricht, *Novitatum Cartesianum gangraena*, XXXV, 7.

Internum and externum in Mastricht's sources

Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae* (1265–1274)

One of the older and key sources frequently used by Mastricht is Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*. One of the aspects Mastricht clearly appreciates is Aquinas's emphasis that knowledge about God is not only acquired through reason or intellect, but most importantly through faith.³⁴ Interestingly, in light of our study, Aquinas clearly differentiates between internal and external causes. Aquinas states that faith has two causes: the offer of faith to a person, and the consent with or reception of that offer by that person.³⁵ This second cause is subsequently laid out in two different (sub)causes: an external and an internal cause. The external cause is being convinced of faith by seeing or experiencing something externally, for instance a miracle. This external cause is not a sufficient cause, as not everyone who witnesses a miracle comes to faith. Therefore, the internal cause, the work of God, is needed. Aquinas calls this internal cause a supernatural *principium* that moves a human internally such that he expresses consent to God's call: "Faith indeed depends on the will of a believer, but the human will has to be prepared by God's grace in order to reach to things that go beyond his nature."³⁶ Thus, the will gets a central and active role. A human is prepared to start believing, but in the end has to decide so himself and has to act himself.³⁷

Mastricht uses the human will in a similar way as Aquinas and also uses the external and internal causes in a similar, yet more detailed way. Both state that the Pelagians think differently about the acts and capacities of the will in this respect. An interesting difference is that Aquinas does not differentiate between moral and physical causes like Mastricht does. It seems that Aquinas gives the will a bit more of a capacity to make a final decision, prepared by God's grace, whereas for Mastricht this decision is fully determined by God's internal physical work.³⁸

34 Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, II,24, 21; cf. Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 91v.

35 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* (Rome: Corpus Thomisticum, 1895), II,1, q.6, a.1.

36 Aquinas, *Summa*, II,1, q.6, a.1.

37 See also Aquinas, *Summa*, I,II, q.113, a.1.

38 cf. W.J. Van Asselt, J.M. Bac, and R.T. Te Velde, ed., *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in Early Modern Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010), 165.

Synopsis Purioris Theologiae (1625)

One of the main introductions to reformed theology at the Utrecht academy in the seventeenth century was the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*.³⁹ The Synopsis consists of 52 disputations, held under supervision of four Leiden professors: Johannes Polyander (1568–1646), Andreas Rivetus (1572–1651), Antonius Thysius (1565–1640), and Johannes Walaëus (1573–1639). The Synopsis regularly differentiates between internal and external aspects of a topic. For instance, Polyander differentiates between external and internal revelation: external revelation is that which can be received through the bodily senses, while internal revelation is provided by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁰

The call is discussed in a separate disputation, supervised by Polyander, which differentiates between a special and universal call, and between an internal and external call. The universal call, also called the natural call, comes to everyone and is a call to acknowledge God as Creator.⁴¹ The special call, referred to as a supernatural call, is a call to Jesus Christ as Redeemer, received through the preaching of the gospel and the power of the Holy Spirit.⁴² Both the universal and special call have internal and external elements. For the universal call, the external aspect refers to creation, which is observed by people who through it can acquire knowledge about God's glory; the internal aspect refers to an inscribing or application of this knowledge in someone's heart.⁴³ Polyander discusses the special or evangelical call extensively, and points at the importance of differentiating between internal and external aspects: "The way of calling is differentiated in external and internal. The call from outside [*foris*] comes through administering Word and sacraments, the [call] from inside [*intus*] through the working of the Holy Spirit."⁴⁴ Interestingly, *external* and *internal* are used here as synonyms of outside (*foris*) and inside (*intus*).

Next, Polyander discusses that the external and internal modes of the call typically cooperate (*concursum*). Yet, in some cases they do not cooperate. Sometimes the Holy Spirit works internally without the external call, but this is rather rare. More often, there is an external call without internal conviction, as in the case of hypocrites. They receive the call, but abuse it through their ingratitude, as they are too involved in worldly affairs.⁴⁵ Their wills and minds are

39 See D. Te Velde, Ed., *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae: Synopsis of a Purer Theology. Latin text and English translation* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

40 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, 1, 15.

41 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXX,2, 3.

42 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXX,2, 5.

43 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXX, 4.

44 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXX, 32.

45 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXX, 40.

not changed, while the elect have their will changed so that they become willing instead of unwilling.⁴⁶

In contrast to Polyander, in the next disputation Rivetus seems to separate the internal and external call:

God speaks to us through His written Word, and preaches through the ministry of the Church, in line with what is written; but next to the external presentation, the supernatural light is added. [W]hen He without means speaks internally to the believers and His internal speaking penetrates into the heart, the true belief is implanted, which would be without the supernatural light only superficial and rational.⁴⁷

It seems that in Rivetus's disputation the 'hypocrites' are only called externally, while in Polyander's the external and internal call are more closely related. Interestingly, Polyander also uses different terms compared to Rivetus, even though the difference might be subtle. Polyander refers to the external and internal aspects as different *modi* of the same call, whereas Rivetus talks about separate external and internal calls.

Mastricht's treatment of the call is largely the same as the one presented in the Synopsis, particularly in the position represented by Polyander. Polyander speaks about the *concursum* of the external and internal modes of the call, which is rather similar to Mastricht who talks about an internal aspect of the external call. Both see resisting the call as sinning against the Holy Spirit. Also, Mastricht's treatment of external senses and internal faculties seems roughly in line with how Polyander talks about a call from the outside and from the inside. However, we note that Mastricht spells out in much more detail these different faculties involved in the external and internal aspects of the call. For Mastricht, the external aspects relate to hearing and the intellect, while the internal aspects relate to the soul or the heart; the will has a pivotal role between the internal and external aspects. Moreover, Mastricht deals much more extensively with the role of the will and freedom than the Synopsis does. Next to that, Mastricht differs from the Synopsis in speaking about moral and physical causes.

Ames's Medulla S.S. Theologiae (1630)

It is often observed that Mastricht's and William Ames's (1576–1633) theologies share many commonalities.⁴⁸ Mastricht himself states that the second part of the *Theoretico-practica theologia*, dealing with moral theology and ascetics, is based

46 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXX, 43.

47 Te Velde, *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, XXXI, 25.

48 For an overview, see Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 7.

on Ames's *Medulla S.S. Theologiae* and *De Conscientiae*.⁴⁹ As Mastricht seems to have extensively used Ames's work, it is likely that these influences also extend to different parts of the *Theoretico-practica theologia*. The *Medulla* is especially relevant here, as this is a systematic piece of theology (in contrast to *De Conscientiae*, which is pastoral) that might have influenced the systematic parts of the *Theoretico-practica theologia* as well.

Ames sees the call as a means to get fellowship with Christ. Therefore, the chapter on calling is entirely devoted to the application of Christ and his work. Yet, he also refers to the call as the offer of Christ, both externally and internally.⁵⁰ The external call is administered through preaching the gospel or the promises of Christ. The preaching comes to everyone, without difference, but only to the elect are owed the promises.⁵¹ The internal offer is a spiritual illumination, through which the promises are offered to the human hearing, "as if through an internal word."⁵² Sometimes non-elect people also receive some internal call, but they resist it. This is referred to as sinning against the Holy Spirit.⁵³ As a result of the call, the believer receives Christ, who is received when grace is implanted in the human will.⁵⁴ The will is the "special and main subject" of this grace, in order to result in someone's repentance.⁵⁵ The intellect is not sufficiently equipped to lead to repentance, as the intellect cannot remove the will's underlying corruption and cannot add a "*principium supernaturale*."⁵⁶ This seems to suggest that the external call relates to the intellect, while the internal call relates to changing the will.

Overall, Ames's and Mastricht's treatment of external and internal calling have quite a striking similarity. Both distinguish between intellect and will in relation to external and internal aspects. Yet, there are also a number of interesting differences. First, the length each author gives to treating these aspects varies widely. Ames discusses calling rather briefly and only treats the call as far as it is relevant to explain how believers receive the offer of Christ. Mastricht devotes much more attention to the call, in a separate *locus*. Moreover, Ames treats the call entirely from the perspective of election or predestination, where only the elect are seen as receiving the internal call, though others also—who resist the

49 William Ames, *Medulla S.S. Theologiae, Ex Sacris literis, earumque interpretibus, extracta, et methodice disposita* (Londen: Robertum Allottum, 1630); William Ames, *De Conscientiae (Oxonii: Guiljelmus Hall / Joh. Adams, 1659)*; cf. Mastricht, *Theoretico-practica theologia*, Praefatio.

50 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 15–16.

51 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 13.

52 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 14.

53 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 15–16.

54 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 21.

55 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 23–24.

56 Ames, *Medulla*, 1,26, 23–24.

Holy Spirit—have received some sort of internal call. Mastricht, however, deals much more consistently with the external and internal as aspects of the same call. Yet, for Mastricht, the internal aspect is not sufficient for saving faith, there he points at the physical grace or cause that is part of the regeneration. Next to that, Mastricht deals much more specifically with the question of how internal and external aspects cooperate. Moreover, unlike Ames, Mastricht differentiates between moral and physical causes.

Voetius's *Disputationes Selectae* (1648–1659)

As Voetius was one of the prominent professors during Mastricht's years as a student in Utrecht, he was likely influenced by Voetius. Even though Voetius's *Disputationes* had not completely appeared in print at that time, Mastricht might have seen part of it or at least visited the disputations which were held on Saturdays.⁵⁷ Thus, not surprisingly, in Mastricht's work we see frequent citations of Voetius.

In Voetius's *Disputationes Selectae*,⁵⁸ the call is dealt with as part of regeneration. In the second disputation on regeneration, Voetius mentions the call as one of the "preceding causes" (*antecedentia*) of faith, after election and covenant. Voetius defines the call as an antecedent that depends on the external call and the internal illumination by the Holy Spirit.⁵⁹ Voetius actually introduced this distinction between external and internal already in the first disputation, which dealt with the role of human reason in matters of faith. Regarding faith, Voetius claims that the Word of God is the external *principium* of faith, while the internal illumination by the Holy Spirit (also referred to as the supernatural light) is the internal *principium*.⁶⁰ No one is able to come to faith through reason as such, without internal illumination.⁶¹ Next, in the second disputation, dealing with regeneration, Voetius uses the distinction between physical and moral causes to separate the internal illumination by the Holy Spirit from the external call through God's Word. The God-given cause of regeneration is physical. The effectiveness of the moral cause, the external call that works on reason, depends on this physical cause. The call is ineffective and insufficient to bring people to faith as long as it stays alone, just as a moral cause is.⁶² Also, the internal call that is based on the external call is insufficient to bring one to faith, since it does not

57 Neele, *Petrus van Mastricht*, 30.

58 G. Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae* (Utrecht: J.A. Waesberge, 1648).

59 Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, II,30, 1.

60 Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, I,1, 2.

61 Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, I,1, 3.

62 Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, II,30, 1.

change the heart and the will. Only regeneration, also referred to as recreation, is able to bring to faith.⁶³

We observe important similarities between Voetius's and Mastricht's treatment of the internal and external aspects of the call. Both state that the call just acts as a moral cause on one's reason or intellect. The external call, when preceded by the physical cause of regeneration, brings one to faith. Both Voetius and Mastricht differentiate between the internal call and regeneration and both use the differentiation between moral and physical causes. At the same time, some details are different. Voetius uses *ratio* where Mastricht mainly uses *intellectus*. In the context of the call and regeneration, Voetius does not speak about will (*voluntas*) or soul (*animus*), he rather seems to conceptualize that the internal call as well as regeneration works on reason (*ratio*). Here, Mastricht instead speaks about the soul (*animus*), which consists of intellect and will.

Turretin's *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (1679–1685)

To further trace potential changes in Mastricht's treatment of *external* and *internal*, we turn to an influential reformed theologian of Mastricht's generation, namely the Genevan professor Francesco Turretin. Turretin published his *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* between 1679 and 1685, and this became an influential dogmatic handbook, not the least through Turretin's extensive international network. Even though Turretin came to Leiden in 1661 and was in touch with Rivetus, we do not know whether he and Mastricht met each other. Nor do we know if they ever read each other's works. In Mastricht's *Theoretico-practica theologia* we do not find any reference to Turretin. Nevertheless, Turretin can function as a relevant benchmark for comparison as a reformed theologian contemporary with Mastricht.

In his first book of the *Institutio*, Turretin discusses some aspects of the call when he discusses predestination. When he deals with the question of why some people, who are reprobate in God's decree, nevertheless get called, he introduces the difference between external and internal calling. He states that the external call is conditional; people are called under certain conditions, which God only fulfills in the elect. The call does not imply that God wants to save everyone, but is first of all meant to present the duty of faith and repentance, as well as to inform about the way through which people can be saved.⁶⁴ Turretin states that the call is

63 Voetius, *Selectae disputationes theologicae*, II,30, 1.

64 Francesco Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae* (New York: Robert Carter, 1847), I,4,12, 25.

subject to the execution of Gods election, both through the external call by the Word as well as through the internal call by the Holy Spirit.⁶⁵ In the second part of the *Institutio*, Turretin deals more elaborately with the call, discussing it in one *locus* together with faith. For Turretin, the difference between external and internal calls is very important, and he mentions it frequently. The external call is received through hearing, the internal call through the soul.⁶⁶ The external and internal calls have multiple commonalities: both are from God, both are focused on sinners, both use as instrument God's Word, and both aim at Gods glory and the redemption of those who are called.⁶⁷ Yet, Turretin also sees important differences. First, the external call just presents a duty, while the internal call supplies the internal capacity to respond to this externally presented duty. Second, the external call just uses the Word, while in the internal call the Spirit also joins. Third, the external call reaches out to many, including the reprobate, while the internal call only reaches the elect. Fourth, the results are different, as the external call remains ineffective, but the internal call is effective. Finally, the external call is only temporary and does not have a lasting effect while the internal call is lasting and unchanging.⁶⁸

Thus, for Turretin the difference between external and internal calls is completely aligned with the difference between ineffective (i.e., the external call without an internal call) and effective calling (which is based on Gods election), and he in fact uses *interna* and *efficax* as synonyms.⁶⁹ Turretin mentions two reasons why he strictly wants to treat the external and internal calls along the lines of ineffective and effective, and why he does not want to acknowledge an internal call in people who will not become true believers. First, he wants to treat external and internal only as logical concepts, not as psychological concepts that relate to human senses or faculties.⁷⁰ Second, Turretin opposes the Socinians and in particular Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621), who give the will too much credit in relation to faith, which is only effectuated through God Almighty.⁷¹ Here, he also refers to the external call as a moral cause, and the internal call as a physical cause.⁷² Yet, Turretin himself does not want to use the term 'physical' to refer to the internal work of the Holy Spirit, as this seems to imply that it is natural rather than supernatural.⁷³ At the same time, he acknowledges that grace is physical in

65 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, I,4,18, 18.

66 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,4, 23.

67 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,1, 7.

68 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,1, 7.

69 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,1, 8.

70 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,4, 38.

71 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,3,4–5.

72 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, I,15,4,6; cf. I,6,5, 2.

73 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,4, 9.

the sense that the Spirit recreates; he therefore prefers rather to speak about 'supernatural' or 'hyperphysical' works of God.⁷⁴

When comparing Mastricht's and Turretin's treatments of the external and internal calls, we see that both differentiate between the different human faculties that receive the call— hearing for the external call, and the soul for the internal call. Yet, Mastricht deals much more frequently with the role of the intellect. Both Mastricht and Turretin speak about the external call as moral. For Mastricht, this moral influence goes as far as the intellect, while Turretin just says that it is received through hearing. It seems that Turretin deliberately refrains from discussing intellect too much in this respect, and he states that intellect is not important with regard to the call and faith; intellect pertains rather to the will.⁷⁵ The main difference between Mastricht and Turretin is that Mastricht speaks about an internal call even in some of the reprobate, while Turretin expressly does not want to acknowledge such a call even though he states that they could experience some sort of illumination—without referring to that as a real internal call. At the same time, Mastricht clearly delimits the role of the internal call, as for him the internal call is not sufficient for faith without regeneration. As such, some of the aspects that Turretin considers to be part of the internal call are for Mastricht part of regeneration instead of the internal call.

In the end, it appears that Mastricht and Turretin use "internal" in different ways. For Mastricht (as well as in the Leiden *Synopsis*), the internal call relates to the internal human faculties that can be reached through that call, the will and intellect being parts of the soul. The external call relates to the external faculties, hearing and sight, subsequently reaching the intellect. Turretin, instead, does not want to use *internal* and *external* in relation to 'psychological' faculties, but rather as a logical division. In fact, Turretin appears to use the Aristotelian difference between external and internal causes with respect to the call, for which the material or (hyper)physical cause is part of the internal causes, whereas the moral cause is part of the external causes. Mastricht uses *internal* with regard to the call rather in a more psychological sense, referring to the internal faculties. At the same time, on a different level, he uses the Aristotelian difference between moral and physical causes, where regeneration, instead of the internal call, is the physical cause.

74 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,4, 18; II,15,4, 23.

75 Turretin, *Institutio theologiae elencticae*, II,15,6, 6.

Discussion and Conclusions

The comparison of Mastricht with a couple of his main sources as well as with Turretin regarding the treatment of external and internal calling shows a large degree of continuity. However, there is one element that is strikingly different, which points at a potential influence from the Cartesian debate: Mastricht consistently differentiates between the different human external and internal capacities. Even though the classical Aristotelian causes are still used, he combines it with a more psychological treatment of human faculties. He differentiates between hearing, intellect, will and heart, where both intellect and will are capacities of the soul. As Mastricht's *Gangraena* in particular mentions these 'faculties' in his debate with Cartesians, it could be that this debate urged him to be more precise. This might indicate a Cartesian influence on his thinking about internal and external calling. At the same time, others after the Synod of Dordt have developed similar specifications,⁷⁶ so Mastricht's precision may also be due to the influence from the Synod of Dordt and the Arminian controversy.

Moreover, in contrast to Turretin, who states that the external call cannot get to the mind or the soul, Mastricht states explicitly that the soul, through its faculties of will and intellect, receives the external call internally. Turretin assumes that intellect has only an evaluative function. Descartes, however, gives the intellect also a perceptive function. The intellect can be seen as a mirror that passively represents an external object.⁷⁷ Thus, this opinion that the soul cannot only form an evaluation, but also can perceive the call internally, could be considered a sign of Cartesian influence.

In general, this study shows that the relationship between *internal* and *external* is not as clear as is sometimes supposed. Some assume that *internal* and *external* often run parallel to the different Aristotelian causes, rather than to a post-Cartesian understanding of object and subject.⁷⁸ Others suppose that reformed theologians typically see *vocation interna* and *vocation externa* as parallel to *vocation efficax* and *vocation inefficax*, respectively.⁷⁹ Yet, this study shows that the situation is more complex. When we look at Mastricht, he uses both the Aristotelian scheme and type of contemporary, perhaps Cartesian-influenced subject-object scheme of the different human capacities or faculties.

Thus, this study on the subject of internal and external calling in seventeenth century reformed theology shows that care and nuance are warranted in interpreting terms like *internal* and *external*, especially in light of the significant shifts in the thinking about knowledge and perception occurring in this time period.

⁷⁶ Van den Belt, "The vocatio in the Leiden disputations."

⁷⁷ See Van Asselt et al., *Reformed thought on freedom*, 213.

⁷⁸ Henk Van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 145.

⁷⁹ Appold, *Abraham Calov*, 126–28.

Gyeongcheol Gwon

Petrus van Mastricht on Christ's Suretyship in the Old Testament

The topic of Christ's suretyship in the Old Testament is neither widely discussed nor disputed today. Most systematic theologies written in the twentieth century and onwards, including Berkoff's, do not even mention it.¹ In the seventeenth century, however, silence on this topic would be rather abnormal. A number of theologians recognized the importance of the topic and covered it in detail. In fact, by the time of the Reformed orthodox, Christ's suretyship in the Old Testament was one of the key theological issues over which leading theologians debated, among them Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669) and Gisbertus Voetius (1589–1676) gave this topic particular attention. Therefore, it was natural for Mastricht to investigate the topic at some length.

In this chapter, I will situate Mastricht's handling of the topic in its due context: the intra-Reformed debate over Christ's suretyship in the Old Testament. My argument is that Mastricht's contribution to the debate lies mainly in including a Voetian message in his unique fourfold approach to theology. Instead of transforming the substance of Voetianism, Mastricht recasts the method of its presentation. Before I move on to an analysis of Mastricht's ideas, a survey of the debate over Christ's suretyship is in order.

¹ Louis Berkoff, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1941). One notable exception is Geerhardus Vos, *His book, Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 2, ed. and trans. Richard B. Gaffin (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2012–2014), 88–89 covers Christ's suretyship in depth.