

The Works of  
**James Arminius**

*The London Edition*

*Translated by*

James Nichols and William Nichols

3 volumes

*Introduction by* Carl Bangs

VOLUME 3

*Translated by*

William Nichols

1875



**BAKER BOOK HOUSE**

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

1996

APPENDIX TO THE PRECEDING BOOK:  
CONTAINING A SMALL TREATISE OF COGNATE MATTER; TO WIT, A BRIEF  
ANALYSIS OF THE NINTH CHAPTER  
OF  
ST. PAUL'S  
EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS,

ADDRESSED MANY YEARS BEFORE TO GELLIUS SNECANUS,

WHEN HIS "INTRODUCTION" TO THIS SAME CHAPTER FIRST SAW THE LIGHT: ABOUT WHICH TIME ARMINIUS HAD RECENTLY BEEN DISCOURSING ON THIS VERY CHAPTER BEFORE HIS CONGREGATION AT AMSTERDAM.\*

---

TO THAT EMINENT MAN OF GOD, GELLIUS SNECANUS, A FELLOW MINISTER MOST BELOVED IN CHRIST, HEALTH AND WELFARE THROUGH CHRIST,—  
IS THE PRAYER OF

JAMES ARMINIUS.

I CANNOT easily express, most excellent man, what intense joy I felt on reading and seriously considering your Commentary on the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. For, when I saw that you had remarked, in the Apostle's scope and treatment of the principal arguments, just what, not so very long before, I had set forth publicly to the people committed to my care, in explaining the same chapter, I was greatly strengthened in that view; as well because I allow very great weight to your judgment, as because I knew that to be correct from the reasons which you had subjoined. I cannot, therefore, but in sheer gratitude transcribe in turn and briefly the steps which I took in the exposition of that chapter, and the causes which impelled me to enter on that particular path: and this not merely to show our mutual agreement, but also to strengthen it as far as I can. I freely confess that that part [of Scripture] always seemed to me enveloped in the densest shade, and most difficult of explanation, until the light shed upon it in this way dispersed the darkness, and gave my understanding a clear view of the place lit up by its brilliance. But I now come to the matter itself.

To begin with the scope: that is the same as of the whole = context

\* Some information about Snecanus, and the origin of this Analysis, will be found on pp. 127-128 of vol. i.—W. N.

Epistle: That the Gospel, not the law, is the power of God to salvation, not to him that worketh, but to him that believeth; because in the Gospel is made manifest the righteousness of God, by which salvation is obtained through faith exercised on Christ. This chapter, however, does its part in confirmation of that proposition, and in a peculiar way. For it defends that against the objections of the Jews, who were endeavouring with all their might to overthrow it, as hurtful and damaging to themselves: and it so defends it against their attacks as to establish it more and more, and to add, by the refutation of objections, strength and firmness to the foundations already laid, from the Divine word and purpose itself, which the Jews forcibly wrested in their own favour to demolish the Pauline dogma. That this is the scope is proved by the connexion itself; the method of which must be sought, partly from this antecedent proposition, that "most of the Jews were rejected," which was included in this proposition of the proem, "I could wish to be anathema from Christ for my brethren," &c.; partly from the denial of the consequent, "But it follows not thence that the word of God has failed." Which two propositions, when joined in one utterance, may be advanced distinctly in this manner: "Although most of the Jews have been rejected, yet the word of God has not failed on that account." Whence it appears as clear as day that the affirmation opposed to that denial was objected to Paul by the Jews, in order that they might convict of falseness that dogma of his, from which so absurd a consequence would follow, by the interposition of that antecedent, (which followed immediately from that dogma of Paul's,) and so might refute it as absurd, in this way: "If most of the Jews have been rejected, then the word of God has failed: But it cannot be that the word of God should fail: Therefore most of the Jews have not been rejected."

But how does this tell against the Apostle? He had propounded a dogma which necessarily inferred the rejection of a great part of the Jews; namely, about justice and salvation being obtainable by faith in Christ, not from the works of the law. From this it was an easy conclusion for the Jews: "If righteousness and salvation consist in faith in Christ whom Paul preaches, then it follows that a great part of the Jews have been rejected from the covenant." The reason of the consequence: "Because most of the Jews do not believe in

Christ." "But it is false that most of the Jews have been rejected by God; for so the word of God would have failed: Therefore the Apostle Paul's dogma, from which that consequent is drawn, is absurd." The Apostle thought that he must refute this objection, which threatened downfall and destruction to his dogma; by showing that that undoubted principle, which the Jews laid down as a fulcrum for their objection, not only did not prejudice his case, but even supported it excellently.

However, the state of the question controverted between the Apostle and the Jews must be properly laid down: for that will give great value to the whole discussion. It is not, "Whether most of the Jews were rejected;" nor, "Whether the word of God can fail." For the Apostle allows that it is wicked even to think the latter; and the former he will afterwards prove by clear Scripture testimonies. But out of both the question is shaped, "Whether the word of God will have failed, if most of the Jews have been rejected." Neither is this enough: for the solving of that question does not settle the whole controversy, nor does it exhaust all difficulties. For, grant that the Apostle gains that by force of arguments,—that it may be that some, nay, most of the Jews have been rejected, and nevertheless the word of God remains firm,—will not this question still remain, "Whether the word of God does not fail, if those Jews are rejected who with the highest zeal strive after righteousness from the law?" Certainly: for it will be easy for the Jews to take exception to the solution of that question: "Even though the word of God may remain firm with regard to the many Jews who have been rejected, yet we cannot be comprehended in that number without the word of God being made of none effect." Therefore the addition of that qualification will complete the whole statement of the question, in this manner:—

"Whether the word of God is not made of none effect, if those of the Jews who seek righteousness, not from faith, but from the law, are rejected by God."

For this question is adapted to the scope: its solution finishes the disputation, and exhausts all the difficulties: this is what the Apostle is treating; as is plain from the argument which he adduces for its solution. For neither must we disjoin from the question that which gave rise to the question, and for the sake of refuting which that principle of the con-

stancy of the word of God was brought forward by the Jews ; and which the Apostle endeavoured to uphold, as much as possible, against the Jews. Let special attention, then, be paid to this point in the question : " Whether the word of the covenant entered into with the Jews is not become void, if the Apostle's dogma of obtaining righteousness and salvation from faith alone in Christ, not from the law or the works of the law, is to find acceptance, and to be held as the foundation of salvation." But how much difference there is between these two ways of stating that question, and of what weight that difference is, you can easily perceive. For that question, propounded in this manner, " Whether the word of God is not made of none effect, if most of the Jews are rejected," may be met by this answer : " That God, indeed, by the word of promise invites all the Jews, and calls them to participation in the covenant ; but yet by His eternal decree and purpose He has determined to make only some from among the Jews actually partakers thereof, the rest being passed by and left in their former state : " which also some assert to be the sum of the apostolical answer to the question proposed. But the question, if propounded in this last manner, " Whether the word of God is not made void, if those of the Jews who seek righteousness, not from faith, but from the law, are rejected by God," cannot be solved except by this answer : " That God, by that very word of His and expression of promise, signified that He would reckon as His sons those only of the Jews who should strive to obtain righteousness and salvation from faith ; but that He would hold as strangers those who should seek after the same from the law."

There is, however, a great deal of difference between those two answers. For by the former the decree of predestination is defined according to the sense of Beza and others : by the latter, according to your meaning. Yet far be it from me on that account to propose such a question, in order to confirm any opinion of yours or mine on the decree of predestination with that answer, which appears to me the only one adapted for solving such a question. However, the passage itself, when looked into, will demonstrate that to be the state of the question, which I have so pronounced ; if, indeed, a right judgment respecting its state can be obtained from the arguments adduced in treating the question, and from the conclusion : which no one will deny who has entered upon even

"the condition of childhood." Let us, then, consider those things in the Apostle's answer.

In the first place the Apostle denies that the consequence, that is, that of the consequent, "The word of God fails," follows in any way from that antecedent which the Jews laid down: in these words: "Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect;" or, "It cannot be, however, that the word of God hath taken none effect." He then subjoins the reason of the denial, and the proof implied in the reason given in an allegorical form from the Scripture, both as dictated by God, and as explained by the Apostle. The reason is from the distinction of the Jews, and the twofold kind of them, with regard to this expression and the Divine purpose; or from the twofold seed of Abraham, of which only one is included in that expression and purpose. "For," says he, "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children:" (verses 6, 7:) but there are among them some "children of the flesh," and others "children of the promise;" from which the conclusion is: "If the word of God does not comprehend all the Israelites together, it does not fail, even though some of their number be rejected; and much less, if those are rejected who, it is evident, were never comprehended in the word itself." Which should by all means have been added, or the question could in no wise have been answered satisfactorily; nay, and was added by the Apostle, as is apparent. For he not only says that not all were comprehended under that expression, but also describes who they are who are accounted by God as children, and those who are not reckoned under that name. For those who are strangers to the covenant are by the Apostle called "children of the flesh," and those who are partakers in the covenant are called "children of the promise." Whence such a conclusion as this may be drawn in refutation of the Jewish objection:

"If the word of God comprehends only the children of the promise, the children of the flesh being excluded; then it follows that the word of God does not fail, even though the children of the flesh be rejected; nay, that it would fail if they were admitted, who are excluded by the very description of the condition of the covenant: But the word of God comprehends only the children of the promise, to the exclusion of the children of the flesh: Therefore the word does not fail, even though the children of the flesh are rejected, &c." And, by

consequent, "the word of God has not failed if most of the Jews have been rejected, provided those very persons are comprehended in the number of the children of the flesh;" which it is clear is so from the description of the children of the flesh.

For, with the Apostle in this place "the children of the flesh" are those who "seek righteousness and salvation by the works of the law." And concerning this class the consequent is in force, deduced from the doctrine of righteousness and salvation to be obtained by faith in Christ. For it does not follow therefrom, that "some Jews have been rejected," except with this remark, as being those who do not believe in Christ, but "seek after righteousness" from the law. But "the children of the promise" are those who seek righteousness and salvation by faith in Christ. Which description of the children of the flesh and of the promise is so plain from the Scriptures as to need no further proof. But the grounds of the proofs may be sought from chap. iv. 9, 10, of this Epistle, also from chapters iii. and iv. of the Epistle to the Galatians, as you have noted, and as I set forth to the people when I was treating of these things.

From this treatment of the question, then, it is evident that it should have been propounded in that second mode, with the quality of the rejected. But now the proof of that reason must be considered, which, indeed, is the assumption, or minor, of the refutatory syllogism. For the consequence of the proposition is of itself clear and manifest. The Apostle therefore proves that the word of promise and of covenant embraces only the children of the promise, to the exclusion of the children of the flesh; and that by a twofold type,—the one taken from the house of Abraham, the other from the family of Isaac. But two things must be presupposed to each of these proofs,—both resting on the apostolical authority, which to us ought to be sacred. The one, that Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, are to be considered not in themselves, but as types, in those passages which he cites. The other, that they are to be considered as types of "the children of the flesh" and "of the promise." For the Apostle proves neither, but assumes both; and not without reason. For it is as certain as can be from the very passages examined that they are, as the Apostle says in Gal. iv. 24, ἀλληγορούμενα, "allegorized;" and that the primary sense which God wished to signify in those places is not literal, but allegorical.

typology

cf. Gal 4

These presuppositions being laid down, the force of the Apostle's argument lies in the fitness of the types and antitypes, which is as great as the immutability and the constancy of Him who willed those to be the types of those antitypes. But it must be observed that that fitness does not exist merely in the third one taken by itself alone, but in the *σχησις* and mutual bearing of the one towards the other, the proper difference of the type and the antitype being always preserved. Which intimation I give, lest any one should suppose it to be necessary that he who represents the children of the flesh should himself be a child of the flesh in the mode of the same definition. Now for the particulars.

The proof from the first type rests upon these two passages of Scripture: "In Isaac shall thy seed be called ;" and, "At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son." (Verses 7, 9.) From which the fittingness presupposed is thus concluded: "Isaac is reckoned in the seed : Isaac is the type of all the children of the promise : Therefore all the children of the promise are reckoned in the seed." The proposition, or major, is comprehended in these words: "In Isaac shall thy seed be called :" the assumption, or minor, partly in those words: "For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son ;" partly in the fitness of which we have spoken. But it is not concluded merely that all the children of the promise are reckoned in the seed, but also that they *only* are so reckoned. For those things which are said respecting Isaac tend to the exclusion of Ishmael; which the Apostle signifies by the adversative article "but," joined to the member opposed to the former negations: "But, In Isaac shall thy seed be called." Whence it is thus concluded: "Ishmael is not reckoned in the seed : Ishmael is the type of all the children of the flesh : Therefore none of the children of the flesh are reckoned in the seed."

I know, indeed, that in that figure no conclusion is drawn except with regard to a particular instance; but the solidity of the conclusion depends on the mutual fitness between the type and that which is foreshadowed in the type by the immutable will of God. And we know that a conclusion is often drawn by necessity of the matter, which cannot be made by syllogistical form. Here many things have been said by us concerning the congruous nature of that mutual affection or relation between Ishmael and the children of the flesh,



Isaac and the children of the promise : in what way that which the Apostle affirms to have been prefigured by that type was fittingly signified by the nativity of each. But I do not think there is any need here to repeat those things, because they serve only for explaining the doctrine, not for confirming it ; and it has been sufficiently proved to us by apostolical authority ; namely, that “ the children of the flesh ” are signified by Ishmael, but “ the children of the promise ” by Isaac.

②

Now follows *the second type*, taken from the family of Isaac ; in which the Apostle affirms the same to be declared as in the other, when he says : “ And not only these, but Rebecca also,” &c. (Verses 10–13.) Therefore the passage adduced to the same end is to be explained in accordance with the same scope. But here three things must be considered in order. First, Certain circumstances peculiar to this type, which add much weight to the Apostle’s proof ; and by which the Apostle obviates beforehand whatever he foresaw might be advanced by the Jews in opposition to the former type, as being hurtful to their cause. Secondly, The word of the Lord which was to Rebecca, which is included as a typical co-proof, illustrated by another passage of a later Prophet. Thirdly, The explanation which Paul, Θεοδίδακτος, “ taught of God,” adduces from the end and scope of the Divine oracle.

As to the First : The Jews could object against the former type, that it was not wonderful if, Ishmael having been rejected, Isaac should be adopted by God as a son ; as well because Ishmael was born of a bondmaid, Isaac of a free woman, as because, before God announced that “ word of promise ”, to Sarah, Ishmael was already born, and possibly had perpetrated those acts which would make him unworthy of that honour and felicity. These are the points which the Apostle meets ; and to the first he replies that the matter was different in the case of Esau and Jacob, both of whom were born of the same father and the same mother, nay, and at one and the same birth. To the latter he answers, that that was said to Rebecca when she was still carrying the twins in her womb, and therefore whilst “ the children were not yet born,” and when they could not have “ done any good or evil,” whereby the one could deserve to be rejected, the other to be adopted. So, that is, by these circumstances, the Jews are deprived of whatever exception they might on their

own behalf have taken against the former type,—that they, namely, could not possibly be reckoned in the number of the rejected, since they were born of the free woman, and sought their salvation by the law.

Secondly: Now the oracle itself, uttered to Rebecca, (verses 12, 13,) must be considered; which is briefly this: “The elder shall serve the younger;” and is explained by the passage in Malachi: “Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated;” and that so as for it to appear that the servitude of the elder was conjoined with God’s hatred, but the dominion of the younger with His love. But here we must repeat what has been before laid down generally,—that Esau and Jacob are considered, not in themselves, but as types; therefore the things which are attributed to them must be accommodated to the antitypes, or rather to the things signified. Wherefore the antitypes also must be considered, before a conclusion similar to the former can be elicited from these, in refutation of the opinion of the Jews, and in confirmation of that of the Apostle.

But, Thirdly, what those [antitypes] are must be collected from the end and scope, which the Apostle has added for the sake of explanation, in these words: “That the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth.” That is, by those words, “The elder shall serve the younger,” spoken to Rebecca when the children were not as yet born, and therefore had done neither good nor evil, God meant to signify nothing else than that He had from eternity determined with Himself His purpose respecting the communication of righteousness and salvation; not that it should embrace all the posterity of Adam universally, but that it should be “according to election,” by which He would discern between these and those, considered not simply in their own nature, sound or corrupt, but in respect of the condition by which righteousness and salvation were to be applied: as the Apostle shows in the words which follow: “That that purpose according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth.” In which words the same description of the antitypes is contained, which before was set forth by “the children of the flesh” and “of the promise:” and here, indeed, more clearly. For the children of the flesh and of the promise are each in this place defined by the Apostle according to their own speciality,—that the former are “of works,”

but the latter of the faith by which obedience is rendered to the call of God. The Apostle therefore says, that "the purpose of God" which is "according to election" is respecting the salvation of those who should have faith in God calling them, and should believe in Christ; not respecting those who should seek salvation "by the works of the law."

Now from these arguments against the Jews' objection a conclusion may be drawn in favour of the Apostle's doctrine of justification, in this way: "If the word and purpose of God be according to election, by which, the elder being repudiated, the younger is taken, then it follows that, even though some of the Jews have been rejected, yet that word and purpose is not of no effect: nay rather, if that purpose which is according to election were now said to embrace all without election, it would become of no effect: But this word and purpose is according to election: Therefore, although some of the Jews have been repudiated, yet that word and purpose does not therefore fail, nay rather, is thereby established, because its nature is to exclude some, as being according to election, whereby one is rejected and another is taken." But indefinite proof of this kind does not suffice for this business: for it remains still further to be proved that those very persons are excluded by this "purpose according to election," whom they rightly concluded, from the Apostle's doctrine concerning justification by faith, to be excluded and rejected; namely, those who were desirous of attaining righteousness and salvation, not by faith in Christ, but by the works of the law. The Apostle therefore makes this addition: whence is drawn this conclusion, to the exhaustion of the whole objection:—"If the purpose according to election depends on Him that calleth, not on works, then it follows that those who are of the works of the law, and seek after righteousness and salvation by the law, are not included in that purpose; but only those who by faith obey God calling and promising: But the purpose according to election depends on Him that calleth, not on works: Therefore those who are of the works of the law are not included in that purpose, but only those who are of faith of Jesus Christ."

The proposition is of itself plain from the phrase, if rightly understood, which signifies that the firmness of "the purpose which is according to election" depends on "Him that calleth," not on works. Therefore this purpose cannot be firm and sure

to those who are of the works of the law, but to those who are of faith. From this meaning I fancy that I get an inkling of the cause why God has put the condition of the covenant of grace, not in the perfect obedience of the law, as before, but in faith in Christ. The assumption rests upon the expression, "The elder shall serve the younger," and on the accordance of the type and antitype; which is this, that what is pre-signified by the type agrees with the antitype. But by the type of Esau and Jacob is presignified, first, that the purpose of God is according to election; then, that that purpose depends on Him that calleth, not on works. The former, indeed, because the one is beloved, the other hated,—the one preferred to and set over the other; which is a sign of the purpose according to election: the latter, because the elder, Esau, is hated and made subject, but the younger, Jacob, is beloved and set over; which is a sign that that purpose does not depend on works, but on Him that calleth: that is, that God loves those who seek righteousness and salvation by faith in Christ; but "hates" those who seek for the same from the works of the law. Whence it follows that *they* are not included in that purpose who are "of the works of the law," but only those who are "of faith of Jesus Christ;" and, by consequence, that those of the Jews were rejected who followed after the righteousness of the law; those were elected and beloved who sought participation in righteousness by faith in Christ. Therefore, so far from the doctrine of righteousness by faith being overturned by the word of the covenant and the Divine purpose, it is established by that alone.

Here also I have explained to the people in what way those Jews who, out of zeal for the law, sought righteousness and life by it, were signified by Esau, the elder; but those who followed after the same things by faith in Christ, by Jacob, the younger. But there is no need to inculcate those things here: the authority of the Apostle is sufficient, who so explains those types, and who briefly concludes thus from the correspondence of the type to the antitype, or thing signified: "Esau, the elder, was condemned by God to bondage under his brother, and was hateful to Him: Esau, the elder, is the type of all those who seek salvation and righteousness from the works of the law: Therefore all those who seek salvation from the works of the law, are condemned to bondage, and are

cf.  
Gal

hateful to God." And, "Jacob, the younger, obtained dominion over his brother, and was beloved by God: Jacob, the younger, is the type of all who seek salvation, according to the grace of calling, by faith: Therefore those who seek righteousness by faith, according to the grace of calling, obtain dominion, and are beloved by God."

Both propositions, or majors, are comprehended in these words: "The elder shall serve the younger;" and, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." The assumption, or minor, is contained in those words: "That the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth;" and rests upon the authority of the Apostle, who so explains those types.

Hence it is apparent that the question was not only about some being rejected, and some accepted, but about the rejected and the accepted being of such a kind, that is, distinguished by certain qualities. And therefore the Apostle here treats not of the Divine decree or purpose by which the one are elected, and the other reprobated, considered simply in their own nature, whether pure or corrupt; but of such a purpose as includes that description of the elect which is here openly remarked by the Apostle in the purpose itself. In which matter consists the controversy between *Beza and his followers*, who defend the former fiercely, and *you*, who inculcate a purpose of salvation of this kind, in which are contained those qualities of them who are to be saved and them who are to be damned. But they will say, that it is indeed true that Ishmael and Esau, Isaac and Jacob, are considered typically; that is, as far as the former bear the image of the children of the flesh, and of those who are of the works of the law; the latter, of the children of the promise, and of those who are of faith: but that meanwhile they also, in the same degree, on their own part belong to those whose type they bear; and that according to the eternal purpose of God, by which He decreed "to make Isaac and Jacob children of the promise, and to endue them with faith in Christ, but to leave Ishmael and Esau in their natural carnal state."

*non-  
sequiter*

For they say that it is necessary to ascend higher, and to inquire why the one is the child of the flesh, the other of the promise; why the one believes in Christ, the other not, but seeks salvation from the works of the law. I answer, That it cannot be proved from this passage that those who bear the

types belong to the antitypes themselves; and if perchance Ishmael and Esau belong to "the children of the flesh," so described, yet it is not taught in this passage that they so belong according to any Divine purpose. For by this "purpose" something is determined concerning the children of the flesh and of the promise; but by that which they mean it is determined concerning men that these shall be the children of the flesh, those of the promise: which therefore cannot be one and the same with the other; since the subject of the one is changed into the attribute of the other; respecting the adequate subject of which, the Coryphæi of that doctrine have not as yet agreed among themselves. And because the question, why some believe and others do not, undergoes the same change of subject and attribute, I maintain that it is not handled by the Apostle here, and has nothing whatever to do with his scope. Let them, therefore, consult other places of Scripture, and see whether they can therefrom establish that decree of theirs. It suffices for us that here is described the "purpose" whereby our righteousness and salvation "of grace" are consistent with themselves, and whereby we can be assured of them in ourselves.

But this is the "purpose," which God ordained—after the former condition attached to the legal covenant had not been performed, and man by the fall had incurred inability to perform it—to enter into the covenant of grace with us by Christ; and, "of grace," to transfer the condition of the former covenant to faith in Christ; by which covenant, believing on Him, we might obtain the same which before we could not obtain except by ourselves rendering plenary obedience to the law. On this purpose it is that the security of our salvation depends, and at the same time its certainty within ourselves. For from this enthymeme we form that conclusion: "I am a believer," or, "I believe in Christ:" "Therefore I am saved," or, "Therefore I am elect." The confirmation of which lies in this proposition: "As many as believe in Christ, them has God determined from eternity immutably to save:" in which words the sum of that "purpose" is contained.

But if any one ask, why God willed Ishmael and Esau to be types of the children of the flesh, but Isaac and Jacob of the children of the promise; I answer, Because it was fitting, for the sake of the signification and of the agreement between the type and the antitype, in respect of the former type, that he who

was born of the bondmaid and by carnal power should be the type of the children of the flesh ; but he who was born of the free woman and by force of the promise, when the flesh was already effete, should be the type of the children of the promise : but in respect of *the latter type*, that he who had been born first should represent the children of the flesh ; and he who had been born later, the children of the promise. The reason will be manifest to any one who considers the agreement between types and antitypes. Yet if any one should ask further, why God willed Ishmael to be born of a bondmaid and by carnal power, and Esau to be the elder ; but Isaac to be born of a free woman and by the force of the promise, and Jacob to be the younger ; I reply, that the same question might be asked, if Isaac and Jacob were placed in the stead of Ishmael and Esau. But in this consists the full liberty of God, circumscribed by no necessity of the Divine properties or of the revealed will ; which whether the properties of the Divine nature, and the revealed will, allow to God in forming that purpose which your adversaries insist upon, let them see to it.

Now let us come to the other objection, which is of this kind : “ What shall we say then ? Is there unrighteousness with God ? ” (Verse 14.) What is asked, or objected, is manifest ; but it is not equally clear what that antecedent is, from which this objection is deduced. Some put it thus : “ If God, without respect to works, hates Ishmael and Esau, and excludes them from the number of the children, but loves Isaac and Jacob, and holds them as children, is He not unjust ? ” But “ it seems to have the appearance of injustice not to render like things to like persons. ” Certainly, if the Apostle had considered those persons in themselves, and not as types of such, (as has been said,) the occasion of that objection might have been of this description. For it is certain that the occasion of the objection arose from the antecedents : but that was not the Apostle’s antecedent, but this : “ God, in the word of the covenant and the purpose which is according to election, embraced those only who should be the children of the promise, who should believe on Christ ; those being excluded who should be children of the flesh, and who sought after the righteousness of the law. ” Wherefrom it followed that “ those of the Jews who from their desire for legal righteousness did not believe in Christ, were rejected ; ” and further, that “ those of the Gentiles who by faith in Christ sought participation in righteous-