

The Order of Divine Decrees in the Theology of John Davenant

Hyo Ju Kang

(Jinju Hwapyeong Church, Associate Pastor, Church History)

- I. Introduction
- II. Davenant's View on the Order of the Divine Decrees
- III. Cameron's View on the Order of the Divine Decrees
- IV. The Order of Divine Decrees at the Synod of Dort
- V. Conclusion

[Abstract]

This paper examines Davenant's view on the order of the divine decrees. His view had not changed during his life. His view before the Synod of Dort, during the Synod, and after the Synod was consistent. Some modern scholars have stated that Davenant's view on the order of the decrees was in line with Amyraut's. In this paper, Davenant's view is compared with Cameron's position which influenced Amyraut's view. Cameron's view was clearly distinct from Davenant's. This difference implies that Davenant held a non-Cameronian view on the order of the divine decrees. One critical point is that, unlike Davenant, the decree of sending Christ preceded the decree of choosing the elect in Cameron's thought. Davenant believed that God's decrees did not just make salvation possible nor were they frustrated. That is another significant point for making a distinction between Davenant's and Cameron's thought. Davenant's view on the universal aspect of the divine decree was based on the universal proclamation of the Gospel which was revealed in Scripture. As such, though both Davenant and Cameron maintained a twofold predestination, the former differed from the latter. Davenant's view on the order of the divine decree was closer to the Canons of Dort.

Key Words: John Davenant, John Cameron, The Synod of Dort, Supralapsarianism, Infralapsarianism, Amyraldianism

논문투고일 2020.12.17. / 심사완료일 2021.02.20. / 게재확정일 2021.03.02.

I . Introduction

Among the Reformed in the early modern era, there were differences concerning the order of the divine decrees. As Pieter Rouwendal comments, the important question was as follows: “Did the Fall precede predestination or did predestination precede the Fall in God’s decree?”¹ B. B. Warfield remarks that the Amyraldian position on the decree of God is clearly different from that of the Reformed position. The “Gift of Christ to render salvation possible to all,” according to Amyraldianism, would be followed by the “Election of some for [the] gift of moral ability,” and then the latter is followed by the “Gift of the Holy Spirit to work moral ability in the elect,” whereas the “Election of some to eternal life with God” precedes the “Gift of Christ to redeem the elect and ground offer to all” in the Reformed position (Supralapsarian or Infralapsarian).²

Some theologians regard the theological position of John Davenant concerning the order of divine decrees as nearly identical with an

¹ Pieter L Rouwendal, “Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy” in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Herman Selderhuis (BRILL, 2013), 554–555; according to Richard Muller’s dictionary, those who adopted the infralapsarianism “define *electio* as that positive decree of God by which he chose in Christ those who will be his eternally, but they view *reprobatio* as a negative act or passing over of the rest of mankind, leaving them in their sins to their ultimate *damnatio*”, but on the other hand, those who adopted the supralapsarianism “define *electio* and *reprobatio* as positive, coordinate decrees of God by which God chooses those who will be saved and those who will be damned, in other words, a fully double predestination, or *praedestinatio gemina*”. Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1995), 234–235; it should be noted that John Davenant in his works sometimes used the word, the “sublapsarian” instead of the “infralapsarian” perspective.

² Benjamin B. Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1977), 31.

Amyraldian view.³ Brian Armstrong considers that Davenant was a “near-Amyraldian”.⁴ Michael Thomas concurs with Armstrong, saying that Davenant was a “forerunner of the theology of Saumur”.⁵ Thomas describes Davenant’s thought concerning the decree of God as an Amyraldian view, saying, “the work of Christ logically precedes the decree of election, which, by supplying to certain persons the condition of faith, fits into the system as that which overcomes the human failure to respond to the gospel”.⁶ If Thomas’ assertion is correct, Davenant’s position would be different from the mainstream Reformed tradition (Supralapsarian or Infralapsarian). Herman Hanko even asserts without any reference that Davenant was John Cameron’s student in the University of Glasgow.⁷ These theologians

3 John Davenant was born in London in 1572. He became a student of Queen’s college at Cambridge in 1587, where he became a fellow in 1594. Subsequently, after obtaining his doctorate degree in 1609, Davenant became Lady Margaret’s Professor of Divinity, and soon after that, in 1614 he was appointed as the President of Queen’s College. After attending the Synod of Dort, Davenant was appointed as the Bishop of Salisbury by King James I in 1621. He retained the position until his death in 1641. The commentary on Colossians, republished by the Banner of Truth Trust in 2005, is well known among many works of Davenant. For the details of Davenant’s life, see Kang Hyo Ju, “The Extent of the Atonement in the Thought of John Davenant (1572-1641) in the Context of the Early Modern Era” (Ph.D., University of Aberdeen, 2018), 23–39.

4 Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2004), 99 n.102.

5 G. Michael Thomas, *The Extent of the Atonement: A Dilemma for Reformed Theology from Calvin to the Consensus (1536-1675)*, Paternoster biblical and theological monographs (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997), 152.

6 G. Michael Thomas, *The Extent of the Atonement*, 151–152.

7 H. C. Hanko, *The History of the Free Offer* (Grandville, Michigan: Theological School of the Protestant Reformed Churches, 1989), Chapter 5, (accessed February 17, 2015), <http://www.prca.org/current/Free%20Offer/chapter5.htm>: Gatiss points out Hanko’s mistake, saying that Davenant ‘learned his hypothetical universalism well before Amyraut had even begun to study theology,’ so Hanko’s assertion would be ‘inadequate and potentially misleading more widely.’ See Lee Gatiss, “Shades of

do not think that there was a distinction between John Cameron's and John Davenant's view regarding the order of divine decrees.

However, others argue that Davenant's view on the order of God's decrees was distinct from the Amyraldian view.⁸ Richard A. Muller regards the position of Davenant as a non-Amyraldian or non-speculative form of hypothetical universalism, which is different from an Amyraldian form of hypothetical universalism. One of the reasons why he gives is that Davenant's view on the order of the divine decrees belongs to the Reformed tradition.⁹ Ian Hamilton concurs with Muller, saying that Davenant "by and large held to the orthodox understanding of the order of the decrees, something Amyraut vigorously opposed".¹⁰ Jonathan D. Moore states that Davenant explicitly defended the "infralapsarian position over and against the Arminian and Supralapsarian positions".¹¹ Moore goes

Opinion within a Generic Calvinism: The Particular Redemption Debate at the Westminster Assembly," *RTR* 69, no. 2 (August 1, 2010), 109.

8 Richard A. Muller, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2012); Jonathan D. Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007); Oliver D. Crisp, *Deviant Calvinism: Broadening Reformed Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014); Michael J. Lynch, "Richard Hooker and the Development of English Hypothetical Universalism" in *Richard Hooker and Reformed Orthodoxy*, ed. Scott N. Kindred-Barnes and W. Bradford Littlejohn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017).

9 Richard A. Muller, "Review of 'English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology'" (April 1, 2008), 150; Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 218.

10 Ian Hamilton, *Amyraldianism - Is It Modified Calvinism?* (Worcester: Evangelical Presbyterian Church in England and Wales, 2003), 2 n.

11 Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 188 n.74: However, Moore only cites Davenant's *Animadversions* when he argues Davenant's position concerning the order of divine decrees, but there are other writings which need to be investigated. It should be examined whether Davenant maintained the same view before the Synod of Dort (prior to 1618), during the Synod and after the Synod. In his response

on to argue that Davenant's later treatises, such as *Animadversions*, explicitly express his position regarding the order of decree, which is an Infralapsarian view.¹²

One crucial source relating to the latter argument is Davenant's short tract, *De Gallicana Controversia* or "The Opinion on the French Controversy".¹³ During his tenor of bishopric in Salisbury, an inquiry was made to him from certain French divines in the midst of a French Controversy.¹⁴ This controversy arose on the teaching of John Cameron, who was known as the Father of Amyraldianism owing to his influence on his pupils in Saumur.¹⁵ In this tract, Davenant

to Samuel Hoard, who was formerly a Calvinist yet converted into the Arminian camp, Davenant published *Animadversions* in order to repudiate Hoard's assertion, namely, that the doctrine of absolute reprobation was a false doctrine. Davenant remarks, "Reprobation is not a denial of sufficient grace, but a denial of such special grace, as God knoweth would infallibly bring them to glory." See Josiah Allport, "Life of Bishop Davenant" in *An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2005), xlii.

- 12 Nonetheless, Moore neither specifically deals with the treatise nor analyses its contents in his book. See Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 188 n.74; Nicholas Tyacke also asserts that Davenant's hypothetical universalism was never identical with Arminianism. Moreover, Davenant's *Animadversions... upon a Treatise intituled Gods love to Mankind* proves that "the practical limits of hypothetical universalism emerge very clearly from Davenant's reply to Samuel Hoard and Henry Mason". See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 99 n.51.
- 13 John Davenant, *De Gallicana Controversia D. Davenantii Sententia*, Appended to *John Davenant, Dissertatio de Morte Christi... Quibus Subnectitue Eiusdem D. Davenantii Sententia de Gallicana Controversia: Sc. De Gratiosa & Salutari Dei Erga Homines Peccatores Voluntate* (Cambridge: Roger Daniels, 1683).
- 14 Allport, *Life of Bishop Davenant*, xlvi.
- 15 Bonet-Maury regards Cameron as the true founder of the "Saumur school of divines". See Gaston Bonet-Maury, "John Cameron: A Scottish Protestant Theologian in France (1579-1625)," *The Scottish Historical Review* 7, no. 28 (1910), 344; There have been other theologians who held the same view to Bonet-Maury on this issue. See François Laplanche, *Orthodoxie et prédication l'œuvre d'Amyraut et la querelle de la grâce universelle* (Paris: Presses Univ. de France, 1965); Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*; Albert Gootjes, "John Cameron and the French Universalist

made a critique on Cameron's position on the extent of the atonement.¹⁶ This is crucial since it shows that Davenant distanced himself from Cameron's thought and expressed his opinions on the controversy. However, when Cameron's view on this doctrine is mentioned in recent scholarship, it has been only for comparing his view with the position of his pupils in Saumur.¹⁷ That is to say that Cameron's view has not been compared with Davenant's position.

Hence, in this paper, the position of Davenant regarding the order of divine decrees will be examined, having consulted his extensive writings. It will focus on the issue, whether or not Davenant's view on the order of divine decrees is identical to Cameron's. For that purpose, Cameron's position will be compared to Davenant's alongside the Canons of Dort. Then, some implications from the comparison between Davenant's and Cameron's view on the order of divine decrees will be drawn in conclusion.

II. Davenant's View on the Order of the Divine Decrees

"Tradition" in *The Theology of the French Reformed Churches: From Henri IV to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, ed. Martin I. Klauber, Reformed historical-theological studies (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014); Frans Pieter Van Stam, *The Controversy over the Theology of Saumur, 1635-1650: Disrupting Debates among the Huguenots in Complicated Circumstances* (Amsterdam & Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1988).

¹⁶ For an analysis of this tract, see Richard A. Muller, "Davenant and Du Moulin" in *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2012), 136-144; For the historical backgrounds relating to the tract, see Richard A. Muller, "Dating John Davenant's De Gallicana Controversia Sententia in the Context of Debate over John Cameron: A Correction," *Calvin Theological Journal* 50 (2015), 10-22.

¹⁷ Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 58-60; Gootjes, 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition', 185-195.

Prior to 1618, Davenant maintained that fallen humankind was the subject of divine predestination. In the twenty sixth chapter of *Determinations*, he stated, “the fall of man is not the cause of reprobation, but that man fallen is the proper subject of both election and reprobation.”¹⁸ This implies that he held to an Infralapsarian view during his tenor as Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge.¹⁹ But, when he published *Animadversions* just before he died in 1641, Davenant emphasised that he did not favour speculating on the order of God’s decrees at all. In his *Animadversions*, for instance, he mentioned that it would be helpful for Christians to understand the “deep mystery” of God if they ponder whether they are elected or whether they are saved, yet, if someone tried to establish an order with regard to God’s eternal free will or intuition, he would deceive himself and trouble others with “vain jangling”.²⁰ Davenant warned

-
- 18 Three years after publishing his *Treatise on Justification*, Davenant published a small folio called *Determinations* or *Resolutions of Certain Theological Questions*. This treatise is a collection of essays, and it consists of forty-nine subjects which Davenant set as theses for his students at Queens’ College in the University of Cambridge. It was published in 1634 and re-published in 1639. See John Davenant, *The Determinations, Or Resolutions of Certain Theological Questions, Publicly Discussed in the University of Cambridge* (London: Hamilton, Adams, 1844), 359; In Latin, “*Concludamus igitur ex orthodoxorum sententia, Lapsum hominis non esse causam reprobationis, sed lapsum hominem esse proprium subjectum tum electionis tum reprobationis.*” See John Davenant, *Determinationes Quaestionum Quarundam Theologicarum* (Cambridge: Thomas & John Buck and Roger Daniel, 1634), 123.
- 19 Davenant’s *Determinations* was probably written during his tenor as Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge (prior to the Synod of Dort). Muller concurs with this opinion. See Richard A. Muller, ‘John Davenant (1572-1641): A Chronological Bibliography [Work in Progress]’ (Unpublished).
- 20 Although he recognised the difference between the views of ‘Supralapsarians’ and ‘Sublapsarians’, Davenant emphasised the futility of discussing about the order of God’s decrees, saying “there is no cause why men should stiffly contend about these Priorities and Posteriorities, which are humane imaginations, or intellectiis nostri

the reader that it was dangerous to imagine the order of God's decrees, because everyone tended to describe it "according to their own manners of imagination".²¹ Then, Davenant stated,

First, whereas he [viz. Hoard] troubleth himself with distinguishing the Supralapsarian and Sublapsarian Doctrine, calling them Supralapsarians who in ordering the eternall decrees of God concerning Election and Preterition or Reprobation place them before the consideration of the fall, and those Sublapsarians who place them after; this pains might well have been spared. For Priorities and Posteriorities in the eternall immanent decrees of God are but imaginations of mans weak reason, and framed diversly (nay contrarily) as well by Schoolmen and Papists as by Protestants or those which are termed Calvinists; and finally they have little or no use in this controversie, as hath been formerly shewed.²²

fictions, as some truly teare them". See John Davenant, *Animadversions Written by the Right Reverend Father in God John, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, upon a Treatise Intituled Gods Love to Mankind* (London: John Partridge, 1641), 22, 24–25.

- 21 In the original, Davenant stated, "so uncertain that amongst twenty who give us such delineations of Gods eternall decrees, you shall not finde two who agree between themselves in numbring them and ordering them... every man ordereth them secundum suone modum imaginandi [according to their own manners of imagination]. To build therefore any doctrines of faith upon the Priority or Posteriority of such decrees, is to build castles in the aire." See John Davenant, *Animadversions*, 14–15.
- 22 Davenant cited Thomas Aquinas' statement: "Aquinas thought it no such matter of moment whether Predestination be considered before mans fall and state of miserie or after: [Part. 1. qu. 23. art. 1.] *Motus non accipit speciem à termino à quo, sed à termino ad quem. Nihil enim refert quantum ad rationem dealbationis, utrùm ille qui dealbatur fuerit niger, aut pallidus, aut rubeus: & similiter nihil refert ad rationem praedestinationis, utrùm aliquis praedestinetur in vitam aeternam à statu miseriae vel non.*" (The movement takes its character not from the end from which, but from the end to which. For nothing recalls so much to an illustration of whitewashing, whether that which is whitewashed might be black, or pale, or red: and similarly nothing recalls to the doctrine of predestination, whether anyone

He firmly believed that the decrees of God belonged to God's secret knowledge which humankind could not understand exactly.²³ This is a crucial presupposition in examining Davenant's position with regard to the order of the divine decrees. In *De Praedestinatione et Reprobatione*, Davenant stated, "Nevertheless, according to the things themselves, which God understands and decrees, certain signs of priority and posteriority can be distinguished according to our understanding."²⁴ In other words, God's decree (priority and posteriority) could be ordered only "according to our mode of understanding" because God's act of decreeing is certainly without any metaphysical ordering or division. Davenant believed that we should not impose our own understanding into God's act of decreeing. With this view, Jonathan Roberts argues, after the Synod of Dort, Davenant hoped "to cool down the heat generated by debate about

is predestined to everlasting life from the state of misery or not. [my translation]
See John Davenant, *Animadversions*, 160–161.

- 23** Davenant cited Hilary's statement, that is, "*Omnia penes Deum aequabili eternitatis infinitate consistunt* [all things belonging to God equally remain eternal and infinite]". See John Davenant, *Animadversions*, 15; Dabney also argues that the question of the order of the divine decrees "never ought to have been raised". See Robert Lewis Dabney, *Systematic Theology* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1985), 233.
- 24** "tamen, ex parte ipsarum rerum quae Deus intelligit et decrevit, signa quaedam prioritatis et posterioritatis distingui possunt, secundum nostrum modum intelligendi." John Davenant, "De Praedestinatione et Reprobatione" in *Dissertationes Duæ: Prima de Morte Christi, Quatenus Ad Omnes Extendatur, Quatenus Ad Solos Electos Restrungatur. Altera de Praedestinatione & Reprobatione ... Quibus Subnectitur Ejusdem D. Davenantii Sententia de Gallicana Controversia: Sc. de Gratiiosa & Salutari Dei Erga Homines Peccatores Voluntate*, ed. Thomas Bedford (Cambridge: Roger Daniel, 1650), 108; this is the translation of Jonathan Roberts. Jonathan Roberts, "The Nature of God & Predestination in John Davenant's *Dissertatio De Praedestinatione et Reprobatione*" (Master of Arts in Philosophy, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2017), 21.

the proper ordering of the divine decrees”.²⁵ Although several modern scholars suggest various opinions concerning Davenant’s position on that issue, it should be noted that Davenant himself urged that the speculative analysis of the order of God’s decrees must be avoided.²⁶

Nonetheless, Davenant did not change his position. For example, he had his own view regarding the order of the divine decrees before he was sent to the Synod of Dort. In *Determinations*, he stated,

But here it must first be laid down, That we do not assign a real precedence or succession of views or decrees in the Divine mind and will; for in God all things are seen and decreed at once from eternity; but, according to our mode of understanding things, like as things depend upon one another by a certain order, so, also we are accustomed to apply the terms former or latter to the Divine intelligence and decrees. Certainly, then, the permission of the fall with regard to God himself, is neither before nor after in Predestination, (for each of them is from eternity;) yet, if we weigh the two things themselves by our mode of understanding, or in their relation to one another, we shall perceive Predestination

25 Roberts, “The Nature of God & Predestination in John Davenant’s *Dissertatio De Praedestinatione et Reprobatione*,” 22.

26 For example, Clausen regards Davenant as a Supralapsarian, though she recognises Davenant’s unwillingness to speculate the divine decrees. By contrast, Daniel argues that Davenant was not a Supralapsarian and Moore attests that he was actually an Infralapsarian. See Sara Jean Clausen, “Calvinism in the Anglican Hierarchy, 1603–1643: Four Episcopal Examples” (Ph.D., Vanderbilt University, 1989), 165, 355, 358; Curt. D. Daniel, “Hyper-Calvinism and John Gill” (Ph.D., University of Edinburgh, 1983), 526; Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 188 n.4; Davenant states, “Such are the discussions which are made by Divines about the signes of Priority and Posteriority in the eternall decrees of God, with great labour and little profit. ... A wise Minister should wholly abstain from handling these thorny questions: however the businesse never ought to come to that point, that if we fail in these our speculations, any reproach should be fastened upon God himself.” See Davenant, *Animadversions*, 375–376.

to be so allied to the fall, that no one can be understood to be predestined, unless he is supposed to be fallen.²⁷

After the Synod of Dort, Davenant held to the same position. In his *God's Love to Mankind*, Hoard tried to divide the Contra-Remonstrants into two groups. On the one hand, he defined Supralapsarians as those who believe that God, in his "mere pleasure", decreed some to be the elect and others reprobate before decreeing all the original or actual sins of all men; on the other hand, he defined Sublapsarians or Infralapsarians as those who hold that God decreed numerous people into "hell-torments for ever" after looking at "miserable humankind" who would inherit Adam's sin.²⁸ Hoard classified Calvin into the Supralapsarian group, whereas Davenant argued that Calvin did not try to determine the order of the eternal decrees of God. It is because Calvin merely wanted to oppose the thought, namely, that foreseen depravity can be a cause or motive of the divine election or reprobation.²⁹ As Davenant put it, "he [Calvin]

²⁷ Davenant, *Determinations*, 119–120; Davenant, *Resolutions*, 354–355.

²⁸ Hoard classified Calvin, Beza, Zanchi, Piscator, and Gomarus as Supralapsarians. He described the latter as those who avoid the 'great inconveniences' of that 'Supralapsarian way'. He added that the difference between the former and the latter is 'not much, and even in their own account too small a discord to cause a breach'. See Samuel Hoard, *Gods Love to Mankind Manifested by Disproving His Absolute Decree for Their Damnation* (London: Printed for John Clark, 1673), 3.

²⁹ Berkhof pointed out that the original point in controversy, since the days of Reformation, had been a question whether 'the fall of man was also included in the divine decree', that is, 'Was the first sin of man, constituting his fall, predestinated, or was this merely the object of divine foreknowledge?'. Supralapsarians, regarding this question, held that the fall of man was included in the divine decree. In this sense, Calvin was 'clearly a Supralapsarian'. Later the controversy was developed by Beza and the original point 'gradually retires into the background, and other differences are brought forward', i.e., the decrees of election and reprobation are prior to that of the fall of man. However, Hoard seemed to refer to the later dispute among the two disputes. Then, it is not

never troubled himself with these imaginary Priorities and Posteriorities in the eternall immanent operations of God.”³⁰ Davenant argued that, if Hoard joined himself with the Remonstrants, he would abandon the doctrine of the Church of England as well as the opinions of Beza, Zanchi and Piscator.³¹ Interestingly, in *Animadversions*, Davenant did not oppose the position of Calvin and Beza with respect to the doctrine of predestination. Rather, he defended their position throughout this work.³² Davenant pointed out that in Hoard’s category “Sublapsarians [viz. Infralapsarians]” he should put those who embraced Augustine’s view and subscribed to the seventeenth article of the Thirty-Nine Articles.³³

Davenant’s view was close to the Infralapsarian view concerning the order of divine decrees in some ways. First, fallen humankind

legitimate to say that Calvin was a Supralapsarian. See Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 118; in Calvin’s works, as Rouwendal argues, there are some Infralapsarian statements as well as Supralapsarian statements. ‘However, one should be aware that the question concerning the order of the decrees was not an actual question in Calvin’s time. It seems that he did not make a conscious choice between supra- and infralapsarianism’. See Pieter L Rouwendal, *Predestination and Preaching: In Genevan Theology from John Calvin to Benedict Pictet*. (Kampen: Sumnum, 2016), 26–27, 147.

³⁰ Davenant, *Animadversions*, 21–22.

³¹ As the Sublapsarians opposed the Arminian doctrine, namely, the ‘conditionate Election and Preterition’, with Supralapsarians such as Piscator and Gomarus, Hoard would oppose all of them if he upholds the Arminian view of predestination. See Davenant, *Animadversions*, 23.

³² Davenant, *Animadversions*, 23, 76, 78, 110–113, 128–129, 145–146, 163, 181–182.

³³ Note that Davenant was not explicitly saying that Augustine was an Infralapsarian or Sublapsarian, but those who agree with Augustine’s view among his contemporaries on the divine decrees are Infralapsarians. If he classified Augustine and his followers who lived before the Reformation as Infralapsarians, it would be anachronistic. Davenant, *Animadversions*, 23; those who maintained Supralapsarian view were also followers of Augustine. As Rex remarks, “Generally speaking only the most conservative followers of Beza and St. Augustine were willing to run this risk at the Synod”. Walter Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy* (The Hague, 1965), 82.

needed their Saviour. In *Determinations*, he wrote,

In the first place, there occurs the consideration of Christ incarnate and predestined, who is the head of all the elect, and the bond of union between God choosing and man chosen. If, then, Christ himself, who is regarded as the head in Predestination, is destined to be incarnate as Mediator, and Redeemer of the fallen, (Heb. ii. 14.) it is manifest, that all they who are chosen in Christ, are to be considered as in need of a Mediator and Redeemer, i.e. as fallen. (Ephes. i. 4.) ... Christ himself is predestinated to be incarnate, and sent as the Redeemer to the fallen and miserable; therefore, men were not predestined in this incarnate Redeemer, unless as miserable and fallen.³⁴

Secondly, Davenant believed that God's decree to permit the fall preceded his decree of election of some to eternal life. He stated that the reprobate were not created in order to be damned by God. For example, in *De Predestinatione et Reprobatione*, Davenant remarked,

Certain persons are created by God, whom he has foreseen never to be partakers of eternal life; they are created, whom he decreed with his own free will to permit, that is, the least kept from falling by special grace; and indeed they are created, whom he decreed to make subject to the most just damnation on account of sins. Meanwhile, this perdition or damnation is not the purpose of the creation, but the recompense of transgression has to be recognised: that the justice of God might stand always according to Hosea, Oh Israel, you are destroyed (Hos. 13:9).³⁵

³⁴ Davenant, *Determinations*, 120; Davenant, *Resolutions*, 355.

This is clearly Infralapsarian language, because Infralapsarians tended to hold that the decree related to sin is “permissive” considering reprobation as an “act of God’s justice”.³⁶ Berkhof stated that Infralapsarians will “admit that sin is included in God’s decree, but hasten to add that the decree, in so far as it pertains to sin, is permissive rather than positive”, then he went on to say that although Infralapsarians regarded the decree regarding sin as a “permissive decree”, they had a distinctive understanding that “this decree rendered the entrance of sin into the world certain”.³⁷

Another comment of Davenant seemed to deny the Supralapsarian view. As Davenant said in his letter to Hildebrand, “It is not only false, but also impossible, that God, who looks at all the future just as he sees the present time from eternity, was able to condemn beforehand even one human, having looked at their sins; nor is said that he created the non-elect to condemn, because he decrees them to have been appointed sufficiently to blessedness in Adam.”³⁸

35 “*Creantur quidam a Deo, quos praevidit aeternae vitae participes nunquam fore: creantur, quos decrevit suo libero arbitrio, idque speciali gratia minime suffulto, permittere; Creantur denique, quos decrevit propter peccata justissime damnationi subijcere. Perditio interim haec sive damnatio non finis creationis, sed merces transgressionis aestimanda est: ut semper stet illud Dei apud Hoseam, Perditio tua ex te. Hos. xiii. 9.*” Davenant, *De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione*, 172.

36 Davenant, *Animadversions*, 22–23.

37 Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 119, 123.

38 “*Non falsum solummodo, sed impossibile est, Deum, qui ab aeterno omnia futura tanquam praesentia intuetur, potuisse vel unum hominem absq; intuite peccatorum suorum praedamnare. Neq; ad damnationem creasse dicitur ipsos non-electos, quod in Adamo ad beatitudinem sufficienter ordinatos fuisse constat.*” Herman Hildebrand, *Orthodoxa Declaratio Articulorum Trium: De Mortis Christi Sufficientia et Efficacia, Reprobationis Causa Meritoria, Privata Denique Communione, Conscio & instante venerando ministerio Bremensi, pro sopiendis inter quosdam collegat hinc exortis controversiis concepta, & in eodem collegio ann. 1639. d. 4. & 3.*

III. Cameron's View on the Order of the Divine Decrees

Compared to Davenant's view, Cameron held a distinctive view on the order of divine decrees. The first decree is about restoring the image of God to his creation, but the justice of God is procured. The second decree is about sending the Son, who saves every single individual who believes in him, that is, those who are his members. The third decree is about rendering human beings adequate to trust. The fourth decree is about saving those who believe. The first two decrees are general, the last two decrees are particular.³⁹ The general or universal decrees are followed by the particular decrees. In the first place, God willed to restore humankind by the undamaged divine justice. This is a general decree without considering its mode (the first and second decrees). Then, in the second place, God willed to restore humankind through his Son who was crucified and raised from the dead. This is a particular decree since it signifies the mode of restoration (the third and fourth decrees).⁴⁰ Cameron remarked,

(Bremae: Typis Bertholdi Villieriani, 1642), 32–33.

39 'Primum decretum est de restauranda imagine Dei in creatura, salua tamen Dei iustitia. Secundum est de mittendo Filio, qui seruet omnes & singulos qui in eum credunt, hoc est, qui eius membra sunt. Tertium est de reddendis hominibus idoneis ad credendum. Quartum de seruandis credentibus. Priora duo Decreta generalia sunt, posteriora duo specialia.' See John Cameron, 'De Ordine Salutis' in *TA ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ sive opera partim ab auctore ipso edita, partim post ejus obitum vulgata, partim nusquam hactenus publicata, vel e gallico idiomate nunc primum in latinam linguam translata* (Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1658), 529b.

40 'Porro secundum modum considerandi nostrum, praecipuae minus praecipuis, & generalia specialibus priora sunt. Cum igitur restauratio imaginis Dei salua iustitia praecipua sit, primum obtinebit locum. Et cum ea duobus modis considerari possit, generaliter sine vlla modi consideratione, vt si quis dicat, 'Deus voluit salua iustitia

The third and the last decrees are not only particular, but also they consider every individual person, but not without order. For God considers human beings as believers before He considers them as being saved; thus, in the decree faith is prior to salvation. Hence, the third decree, regarding rendering human beings fit to trust, precedes the fourth decree. But all these are to be understood with regard to the things accommodated by God to the weakness of human nature.⁴¹

Two universal decrees relating to the restoration of the divine image and to sending Christ are followed by two particular decrees pertaining to granting of faith and to saving those who have faith.

Davenant did not explicitly comment on Cameron's view with regard to the order of the divine decrees. In his *Animadversions*, Davenant only criticised Jacob Arminius' view from which the

restaurare genus humanum', rem enunciat, modum vero rei non declarat, vel specialiter, vt si quis dicat, 'Deus voluit per Filium suum crucifixum & excitatum a mortuis restaurare genus humanum', non modo rem significat, secundo loco in Deo considerata venit. (Then, according to the mode of being considered, the general prior decrees are followed by special decrees. Hence, when the restoration of image of God might be the particular intact justice of God, it will occupy the first place. And when it could be considered by two modes, generally without any consideration of mode, as if it says, 'God willed to restore human race without justice', it announces the thing, it truly does not declare the mode of the thing, or specially, as if he says, 'God willed to restore human race through His Son crucified and raised from the dead', it not only signifies the thing by mode, it comes to the second place considered in God.) See Cameron, *De Ordine Salutis*, 529b.

41 *'Tertium vero & vltimum decretum sunt non modo specialia, sed respiciunt etiam indiuidua & singulas personas, non sine ordine tamen. Nam prius Deus considerat hominem vt credentem quam consideret vt seruandum: itaq; in decreto prior est fides quam salus. Tertium igitur decretum, de reddendis hominibus idoneis ad credendum, praecessit quartum. Atque haec omnia intelligenda sunt de Deo dicta accommodate ad infirmitatem ingenij humani.'* See Cameron, *De Ordine Salutis*, 529b.

Remonstrant view was derived.⁴² Davenant described Arminius' thought on the order of God's decrees in four ways: first, the decree of sending Christ to corrupted humankind; second, the decree of deciding who is elected and who is not elected, on the basis of the foreseen knowledge of God; third, the decree of granting the means of grace; lastly, the decree of saving some and leaving others in damnation on the basis of the prescience of God.⁴³ When the position of Davenant is compared with Cameron's and Arminius', it can be tabulated as following:

42 The sevenfold Remonstrant view of decrees was an 'expanded version' of the fourfold scheme of Jacob Arminius. Sinnema says, 'The product was a full set of decrees corresponding to the historical order'. Donald W Sinnema, "The Issue of Reprobation at the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) in Light of the History of This Doctrine" (University of St. Michael's College, 1985), 310.

43 Davenant, *Animadversions*, 41; Warfield describes the Arminian position on the order of the Divine decrees as follows: 1. Permission of Fall-(physical) deterioration (followed by moral); 2. Gift of Christ to render the gift of sufficient grace possible; 3. Gift of sufficient(suasive) grace to all; 4. Salvation of all who freely co-operate with this grace. It needs to be noted that the Amyraldian scheme is slightly different from the Arminian one. According to the Amyraldian scheme the order of the divine decrees can be presented thus: 1. Permission of Fall - corruption, guilt and moral inability; 2. Gift of Christ to render salvation possible to all; 3. Election of some for the gift of moral ability; 4. Gift of the Holy Spirit to work moral ability in the elect. See Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, 31; an important difference between the Arminian scheme and the Amyraldian's is that in Amyraut's view on the order of the divine decrees, 'the decree of election is posterior to that of redemption, and comes in only to rescue the first one from failure'. See Amar Djaballah, "Controversy on Universal Grace," in *From Heaven He Came and Sought Her*, ed. David Gibson and Jonathan Gibson (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2013), 191.

Order	Davenant's view	Arminius' view	Cameron's view
First	Permission of the fall of humankind	Sending Christ to fallen humankind	Restoring the image of God into the creation
Second	Election of some out of fallen humankind	Election of some on the basis of the foreseen knowledge of God	Sending Christ, who saves those who believe in him
Third	Granting the gift of Christ	Granting the means of grace	Rendering some fit to trust
Fourth	Granting the gift of the Holy Spirit to the elect	Saving some on the basis of the prescience of God	Saving those who believe

Table 1. Comparison concerning the order of the divine decrees

Concerning the first decree in Arminius' view, i.e., "an absolute decree of giving Christ for a Mediator and Redeemer unto mankind considered as faln [viz. fallen], in the state of sin", Davenant maintained that Arminius made an error in separating Christ from the elect, namely, that God made a decree for the predestination of Christ and then made another decree for his subordinated members, that is the elect.⁴⁴ He remarked, "for as it were an absurd imagination to conceive that God first decreed to make Adams head, and then by another decree, to make him members subordinate to his head; so is it, to frame a particular decree for the Predestination of Christ, and then to devise another for the Predestination of his subordinate members."⁴⁵

One common feature between Cameron's and Arminius' view was that they placed the decree of sending Christ prior to the decree of electing some people, whereas Davenant placed the decree of

⁴⁴ Davenant, *Animadversions*, 15.

⁴⁵ Davenant, *Animadversions*, 15.

electing some prior to the decree of sending Christ into the world. Since Cameron also maintained that the decree of sending Christ preceded the decree of rendering some people in a fit state to believe, Davenant's criticism, namely, the error of separating the decree of Christ from the decree of his members, is applied to Cameron. If the decree of sending Christ precedes the decree of election, Christ's death might be regarded as a universal remedy, but the decree of sending Christ does not carry the application of Christ's atonement. In Davenant's thought, the decree of election precedes the decree of sending Christ, which means that the gift of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit are given to the elect alone. They are infallibly saved according to this order of the decrees. That is to say, there is no frustration of God's will in Davenant's view. The decree of separating the non-elect from the elect was still in effect when Christ came to the world to save those who believe, whereas in Cameron's thought, this decree of election became in effect only after the unregenerate choose to remain in their unbelief.⁴⁶

Moreover, it should be noted, as Albert Gootjes points out, that in Cameron's view "the universality or particularity of the decrees does *not* correspond to their absoluteness or conditionality (italics original)".⁴⁷ From the first to the third decree there is no condition, that is, they are absolute, but only the fourth decree is conditional in Cameron's thought.⁴⁸ Cameron believed that certain qualities of God require no object. If they require a certain object, they do not

⁴⁶ Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle*, 89 n.27.

⁴⁷ Gootjes, 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition', 186.

⁴⁸ Cameron's followers, e.g. Amyraut, La Place and Cappel, maintained the similar view with Cameron though they had slight differences regarding conditioned and absolute decrees. See Gootjes, 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition', 189-196.

demand any condition because they flow from his power and wisdom.⁴⁹ From the decree of restoring the image of God in creation to the decree of rendering faith to some, no condition is required because they are absolute.⁵⁰ But, the last decree of saving those who believe requires a condition, namely, faith and repentance.⁵¹

For Davenant, the divine decrees are absolute. It does not mean that God made a decree which reveals how many people would go to heaven in time, but rather Davenant argued that God's decree was secretly made for the people, whom he pleased to choose in eternity, to possess the kingdom of heaven without failure.⁵² As he said, "for that this eternall decree, *Quicumque crediderit & perseveraverit, salvus erit* [whoever might believe and persevere will be saved], might stand true, though no man in the world should either believe or be saved."⁵³ Davenant wrote that the work of grace which flows from the divine predestination never failed to bring the elect to eternal salvation.⁵⁴ The true predestination is the decree which prepares and declares the effectual grace to bring the elect infallibly

49 Cameron, *De Ordine Salutio*, 529a.

50 Cameron, *De Ordine Salutio*, 529a: Gootjes rightly interpretes Cameron's statements that the restoration of the world and the production of faith require no condition. See Gootjes, 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition', 186.

51 '*Porro totidem sunt genera Decretorum, vnum eorum quae conditionem requirunt, alterum quae nullam requirunt. Id conditionatam, hoc vero absolutum licet appellare. A priori illo pendet Justificatio, vnde & ipsa conditionem requirit. Fidem & Poenitentiam. A posteriori isto Vocatio, vnde sit vt nullam requirat conditionem.*' (Moreover, there are the same number of modes of Decrees, some of which require condition, others which require no condition. The former is conditional, and the latter is indeed absolute as one may call it. Justification depends on that former decree, from where it requires condition, Faith and Repentance. Calling depends on the latter decree, from where it might require no condition.) See Cameron, *De Ordine Salutio*, 529b.

52 Davenant, *Animadversions*, 16.

53 Davenant, *Animadversions*, 16.

54 Davenant, *Animadversions*, 16.

to glory.⁵⁵

IV. The Order of Divine Decrees at the Synod of Dort

At the Synod of Dort, the British delegation presented their position as an Infralapsarian view. In the Collegiat Suffrage of Great Britain, the first article read,

The decree of election, or predestination to salvation, is the effective will of God, by which according to his own good pleasure, he intended [viz. purposed] the salvation of the fallen human being for the demonstration of his mercy, and prepared such means, by which he willed to lead [viz. would bring] the elect efficaciously and infallibly to the [self] same end.⁵⁶

They explicitly said that God intended the salvation of the “fallen human being”.⁵⁷ Concerning the doctrine of reprobation, they

⁵⁵ Davenant, *Animadversions*, 16.

⁵⁶ *Decretum Electionis, seu Praedestinationis ad salutem, est efficax voluntas Dei, qua pro suo beneplacito, ad demonstrationem suae misericordiae, salutem hominis lapsi intendit, eique media talia praeparavit, quibus electos ad istum finem, efficaciter & infallibiliter perducere voluit.* See ACTA SYNODI NATIONALIS, In Nomine Domini Nostri IESV CHRISTI, Autoritate ILLVSTR. ET PRAEPOTENTVM DD. ORDINVM GENERALIVM FOEDERATI BELGII PROVINCIARVM, DORDRECHTI HABITAE ANNO 1618 ET 1619. Accedunt Plenissima, de Quinque Articulis, Theologorum Judicia. (LVGDVNI BATAVORVM: Typis ISAACI ELZEVIRI, Academiae Typographi, Societatis DORDRECHTANAE sumptibus, 1620), II: 3; for other possible translated words in brackets, see John Davenant et al., *The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britaine, Concerning the Five Articles Controverted in the Low Countries. Which Suffrage Was by Them Delivered in the Synod of Dort, March 6 Anno 1619. Being Their Vote or Voice Foregoing the Joint and Publique Judgment of That Synod* (London: Printed for Robert Millbourne, 1629), 1–2.

⁵⁷ J. V. Fesko, ‘Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort’ in *Drawn Into Controversie:*

recorded,

Reprobation properly called, or non-election, is the eternal decree of God, by which he purposed [viz. decreed], according to his most free will, not so far to have mercy on certain human beings fallen in Adam, that he might rescue them efficaciously from the state of misery through Christ and might bring them infallibly to blessedness.⁵⁸

Again they stated that God decreed not to have pity on some people “fallen in Adam”. Thus, when they defined election and reprobation, they carefully recorded the Infralapsarian expressions. As Fesko argues, the British delegation was so specific regarding this issue because, when they were sent to Holland, they were instructed to remain within the doctrinal standards of the Church of England.⁵⁹ They maintained at the Synod that the Thirty-Nine Articles were in accord with the Infralapsarian position. For instance, in Session 108, Bishop George Carleton spoke, “Dr. Gomarus told the Synod in the morning, that the question, whether Fallen Man were the Object of Predestination, had not been decided in the Confession of the French churches; and he said the same thing, if I and my Collegues heard

Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism, ed. Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 106.

⁵⁸ *‘Reprobatio proprie dicta, seu non-electio, est aeternum Dei decretum, quo statuit, pro liberrima sua voluntate, quarundam personarum in Adamo lapsarum, non usque eo misereri, ut eas per Christum efficaciter eripiat e statu miseriae, & infallibiliter ad beatitudinem perducatur.’* See *Acta Synodi Nationalis*, II: 11; Davenant et al., *The Collegiat Suffrage*, 30.

⁵⁹ Fesko remarks, ‘they were instructed not to commit the Church of England to any new doctrinal positions and to remain firmly within the confines of the Thirty-Nine Articles.’ See Fesko, ‘Lapsarian Diversity’, 106.

him right, of the Confession of the English church; for which cause, I beg the Doctor, in my own and Brethrens name, that he would declare, whether he said so or not?” Gomarus replied that the Thirty-Nine Articles “determined the Object of Predestination no otherwise than by the words, Some out of Mankind!” However, the bishop disagreed. Thomas Goad read out the 17th Article, which recorded, “To deliver from Curse and Damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of Mankind,” and Goad said, “the former part of which, namely, from Curse and Damnation, had been omitted by Gomarus.”⁶⁰ As Goad pointed out the article recorded that God determined as the object of predestination some out of mankind “from curse and damnation”. This implied that they held to the Infralapsarian view.

The position of Davenant and his colleagues was in line with the first article of the first head of the Canons, “Since all human beings fell [viz. sinned] in Adam, and lie under the curse, and are deserving

60 Gerard Brandt, *The History of the Reformation, and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions in and about the Low-Countries, from the Beginning of the Eighth Century down to the Famous Synod of Dort, Inclusive in Which All the Revolutions That Happen'd in Church and State, on Account of the Divisions Between The Protestants and Papists, The Arminians and Calvinists, Are Fairly and Fully Represented* (London: Printed by T. Wood, for John Nicks, 1723), 244-245; The seventeenth article reads as follows, ‘*Prædestinatio ad uitam, est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante iacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decreuit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, à maledicto et exitio liberare, atque ut uasa in honorem efficta, per Christum ad æternam salutem adducere.*’ (Predestination to life, is the eternal purpose of God, by which he firmly [viz. constantly] decreed, before the foundation of the world was established, by his counsel secret to us to liberate *from curse and damnation* those whom he chose in Christ out of the human race and to bring them as vessels formed to honour to eternal salvation through Christ. [emphasis added]) I consulted the American revision version of the English translation(1801). See Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), 497; Fesko, *Lapsarian Diversity*, 106 n.28.

of eternal death, God would have done injustice to nobody even if he had willed to leave behind the whole human race in sin and curse, and to condemn them on account of sin, according to the words of the Apostle (Romans 3:19, 23; 6:23).⁶¹ The Canons, as we can observe, firstly mentioned the fall of humankind before stating the decree of election. The seventh article read,

Election is the unchangeable purpose of God, whereby, before the foundation of the world, he hath, out of mere grace, according to the sovereign good pleasure of his own will, chosen, from the whole human race, *which had fallen through their own fault, from their primitive state of rectitude, into sin and destruction*, a certain number of persons to redemption in Christ, whom he from eternity appointed the Mediator and head of the elect, and the foundation of salvation (italics added).⁶²

61 *CVM omnes homines in Adamo peccaverint, & rei sint facti maledictionis & mortis aeternae, Deus nemini fecisset injuriam, si universum genus humanum in peccato & maledictione relinquere, ac propter peccatum damnare voluisset, juxta illa Apostoli* (Rom. 3:19, 23; Rom. 6:23). See The Synod of Dort, *Iudicium Synodi Nationalis*, 3; 'As all men have sinned in Adam, lie under the curse, and are obnoxious to eternal death, God would have done no injustice by leaving them all to perish, and delivering them over to condemnation on account of sin, according to the words of the Apostle "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God (Rom. 3:19)", "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God (Rom. 3:23)" and "for the wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23)".' This is the translation of the Constitution of the Reformed (formerly Reformed Dutch) Church in America. See Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, 581.

62 *'Est autem Electio immutabile Dei propositum, quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta ex universo genere humano, ex primaeva integritate in peccatum & exitium sua culpa prolapsa, secundum liberrimum voluntatis suae beneplacitum, ex mera gratia, certam quorundam hominum multitudinem, alijs nec meliorum, nec digniorum, sed in comuni miseria cum alijs jacentium, ad salutem elegit in Christo, quem etiam ab aeterno Mediatorem & omnium Electorum Caput, salutisque fundamentum constituit.'* See The Synod of Dort, *Iudicium Synodi Nationalis*, 7; Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, 582.

The phrase “from the whole human race, which had fallen through their own fault” should be highlighted since it implies the Infralapsarian view with respect to the order of the divine decrees. Nonetheless, the Canons neither condemn nor comment negatively on the Supralapsarian view.⁶³

Armstrong states, “There is very little in it [Cameron’s view] which differs from the orthodox expression found in the Canons of Dort.”⁶⁴ However, Cameron’s position does not seem to be “very little” different from that of the Canons for three reasons. First, as we have already pointed out, Cameron put the decree of sending Christ prior to the decree of electing some people which separates Christ from his members. This is different from both Supra- and Infralapsarian views.⁶⁵ Second, it is ambiguous in Cameron whether or not the first decree (restoring the image of God into the creation) fits either the Supralapsarian or Infralapsarian view. Third, unlike the Supra- and Infralapsarian views, the last decree (saving those who believe) in

63 Rex states, “The Canons did not attempt to decide the question: although by implication they seem to favor the milder infralapsarians, the formulae are ambiguous enough to leave room for the supralapsarians also”. See Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle*, 82; Fesko concurs with Rex’s opinion, saying, ‘though the Canons decided for homo lapsus, there is no mention, either positive or negative, of the supralapsarian position. The Synod wished to leave supralapsarianism as a “private opinion” and left the Canons silent on the issue’. See Fesko, *Lapsarian Diversity*, 120–23.

64 Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 59.

65 Rex remarks, ‘Cameron brought to France an antidote to the stultifying rigidity of the post-Dordrecht conservatives; his re-thinking of the theological commonplaces set Calvinism on a new path after his death’. It is not surprising to observe that Pierre Du Moulin, in his letter to the Synod of Alençon (1637), mentioned, ‘liberal theology [the Amyraldian view] reversed the usual order of the Divine Decrees’, Du Moulin regarded the origin of an innovation as Cameron’s thought. See Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle*, 88–89, 89 n. 27.

Cameron's formula is conditional. Cameron's view, unlike Davenant's, was not compatible with the Canons.

V. Conclusion

We have examined Davenant's view on the order of the divine decrees. His view had not changed during his life. His view before the Synod of Dort, during the Synod, and after the Synod was consistent. Some modern scholars have stated that Davenant's view on the order of the decrees differed from Amyraut's.⁶⁶ We have compared Davenant's view with Cameron's position which influenced his disciple's view.⁶⁷ As we have observed in detail, Cameron's view was clearly distinct from Davenant's. This difference implies that Davenant held a non-Cameronian view on the order of the divine decrees. One critical point was that, unlike Davenant, the decree of sending Christ preceded the decree of choosing the elect in Cameron's thought.

Cameron upheld his own distinctive order of the divine decrees, whereas Davenant's position was close to the Infralapsarian view which was endorsed by the Canons. Although Davenant consistently urged his hearers to avoid the speculative analysis of the divine decrees, his description concerning election and reprobation showed that he believed the Infralapsarian view was correct and that it was the position of the Church of England. This is crucial in order to

⁶⁶ Djaballah, 'Controversy on Universal Grace', 197; Moore, *English Hypothetical Universalism*, 188 n.74; Crisp, *Deviant Calvinism*, 184–186.

⁶⁷ Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 58–60; Gootjes, 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition', 186–196.

distinguish Davenant's position from the Cameronian view on the order of the divine decrees. It is evident that he did not hold the position which Cameron and his followers upheld later.⁶⁸ Modern scholars have discussed Davenant's view on the order of the divine decrees. Some have argued that it was the Infralapsarian view, but they do not provide sufficient proof. In this paper, it has been substantiated, analysing not only his later work, *Animadversions*, but also his earlier works such as *Determinationes* and the British delegation's writings presented at the Synod of Dort. Davenant's view on that doctrine had not changed though he frequently stated that he did not want to speculate the order of the decrees in *Animadversions*.

It is likely that Cameron favoured neither a Supra- nor Infralapsarian order of the decrees. It was crucial to recognise that Cameron placed the sending of Christ prior to the electing some people unlike the orthodox position of the Canons of Dort. Thus, in Cameron's view the redemptive work of Christ was ordained for all people. His concept of the antecedent and consequent love of God, then, was consistent with his view on the order of the decrees due to the conditionality in saving those who believe. That is to say, those who anticipate the divine antecedent love by faith might be saved, yet faith is a gift – not conditional, but refusable one. This antecedent and consequent love was in accord with Cameron's twofold predestination. The decree of granting salvation left a space for human beings to believe or not to believe. According to the decree of granting faith, the elect will be saved.

⁶⁸ Gootjes explores how Cameron's view on the order of the divine decrees was developed by his followers. This aspect of the studies is beyond the scope of this paper. See Gootjes, 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition'.

In this formula of Cameron, unlike Davenant, there was a possibility of a frustration of the divine decree. Davenant believed that God's decrees did not just make salvation possible nor were they frustrated. That is another significant point for making a distinction between Davenant's and Cameron's thought. Davenant's view on the universal aspect of the divine decree was based on the universal proclamation of the Gospel which was revealed in Scripture. Since Davenant stuck to the Scholastic distinction between the common order of providence and special providence, he maintained that the divine decree was not to be frustrated. As such, though both Davenant and Cameron maintained a twofold predestination, the former differed from the latter. Davenant's twofold predestination was closer to the Canons of Dort.

[Bibliography]

ACTA SYNODI NATIONALIS, In Nomine Domini Nostri IESV CHRISTI, Autoritate ILLVSTR. ET PRAEPOTENTVM DD. ORDINVM GENERALIVM FOEDERATI BELGII PROVINCIARVM, DORDRECHTI HABITAE ANNO 1618 ET 1619. Accedunt Plenissima, de Quinque Articulis, Theologorum Judicia. LVGDVNI BATAVORVM: Typis ISAACI ELZEVIRI, Academiae Typographi, Societatis DORDRECHTANAE sumptibus, 1620.

Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1996.

Brandt, Gerard. *The History of the Reformation, and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions in and about the Low-Countries, from the Beginning of the Eighth Century down to the Famous Synod of Dort, Inclusive in Which All the Revolutions That Happen'd in Church and State, on Account of the Divisions Between The Protestants and Papists, The Arminians and Calvinists, Are Fairly and Fully Represented*. London: Printed by T. Wood, for John Nicks, 1723.

Cameron, John. *Amica Collatio De Gratiae Et Voluntatis Humanae Concursu In Vocatione & Quibusdam Annexis, Instituta Inter cl. V. Danielem Tilenum et Johannem Cameronem*. Saumur: Lvgdvni Batavorvm Sumptibus Benedicti Mignonii, 1622.

_____. 'Concerning the Three-Fold Covenant of God with Man' in *The True Bounds of Christian Freedom Or a Treatise Wherein the Rights of the Law Are Vindicated, the Liberties of Grace Maintained: And the Several Late Opinions against the Law Are Examined and Confuted*. Edited by Samuel Bolton. London: Printed, for P.S. and are to be sold by

- Austin Rice at the three Hearts at the west end of Pauls., 1656.
- _____. 'De Electionis Oppositae Reprobationis Obiecto' in *TA ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ Sive Opera Partim Ab Auctore Ipso Edita, Partim Post Ejus Obitum Vulgata, Partim Nusquam Hactenus Publicata, Vel e Gallico Idiomate Nunc Primum in Latinam Linguam Translata*. Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1658.
- _____. 'De Ordine Salutis' in *TA ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ Sive Opera Partim Ab Auctore Ipso Edita, Partim Post Ejus Obitum Vulgata, Partim Nusquam Hactenus Publicata, Vel e Gallico Idiomate Nunc Primum in Latinam Linguam Translata*. Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1658.
- _____. 'De Triplici Dei' in *TA ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ Sive Opera Partim Ab Auctore Ipso Edita, Partim Post Ejus Obitum Vulgata, Partim Nusquam Hactenus Publicata, Vel e Gallico Idiomate Nunc Primum in Latinam Linguam Translata*. Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1658.
- _____. *TA ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ Sive Opera Partim Ab Auctore Ipso Edita, Partim Post Ejus Obitum Vulgata, Partim Nusquam Hactenus Publicata, Vel e Gallico Idiomate Nunc Primum in Latinam Linguam Translata*. Geneva: Petrus Chouët, 1658.
- Clausen, Sara Jean. *Calvinism in the Anglican Hierarchy, 1603-1643: Four Episcopal Examples*. Unpublished Ph.D., Vanderbilt University, 1989.
- Crisp, Oliver D. *Deviant Calvinism: Broadening Reformed Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
- Dabney, Robert Lewis. *Systematic Theology*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1985.
- Daniel, Curt. D. *Hyper-Calvinism and John Gill*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Edinburgh, 1983.

Davenant, John. *A Dissertation on the Death of Christ*. Weston Rhyn: Quinta Press, 2006.

_____. *An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians*, Translated by Josiah Allport. London: Hamilton, Adams and Company, 1832.

_____. *Animadversions Written by the Right Reverend Father in God John, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, upon a Treatise Intituled Gods Love to Mankind*. London: John Partridge, 1641.

_____. 'De Gallicana Controversia D. Davenantii Sententia', Appended to John Davenant, *Dissertatio de Morte Christi... Quibus Subnectitur Ejusdem D. Davenantii Sententia de Gallicana Controversia: Sc. De Gratiōsa & Salutari Dei Erga Homines Peccatores Voluntate*. Cambridge: Roger Daniels, 1683.

_____. 'De Prædestinatione et Reprobatione' in *Dissertationes Duæ: Prima de Morte Christi, Quatenus Ad Omnes Extendatur, Quatenus Ad Solos Electos Restrīngatur. Altera de Prædestinatione & Reprobatione ... Quibus Subnectitur Ejusdem D. Davenantii Sententia de Gallicana Controversia: Sc. de Gratiōsa & Salutari Dei Erga Homines Peccatores Voluntate*. Edited by Thomas Bedford. Cambridge: Roger Daniel, 1650.

_____. *Dissertatio de Morte Christi Per Reverendissimum Virum Joannem Davenantium: Quibus Subnectitur Ejusdem D Davenantii Sententia de Gallicana Contro*. Cambridge: Roger Daniel, 1683.

_____. *Dissertationes Duæ: Prima de Morte Christi, Quatenus Ad Omnes Extendatur, Quatenus Ad Solos Electos Restrīngatur. Altera de Prædestinatione & Reprobatione ... Quibus Subnectitur Ejusdem D. Davenantii Sententia de Gallicana*

Controversia: Sc. de Gratiōsa & Salutari Dei Erga Homines Peccatores Voluntate. Edited by Thomas Bedford. Cambridge: Roger Daniel, 1650.

Davenant, John. George Carleton, Samuel Ward, Thomas Goad, and Walter Balcanquall. *The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britaine, Concerning the Five Articles Controverted in the Low Countries. Which Suffrage Was by Them Delivered in the Synod of Dort, March 6 Anno 1619. Being Their Vote or Voice Foregoing the Joint and Publique Judgment of That Synod.* London: Printed for Robert Milbourne, 1629.

Djaballah, Amar. 'Controversy on Universal Grace,' in *From Heaven He Came and Sought Her.* Edited by David Gibson and Jonathan Gibson. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2013.

Fesko, J. V. 'Lapsarian Diversity at the Synod of Dort' in *Drawn Into Controversie: Reformed Theological Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism.* Edited by Michael A. G. Haykin and Mark Jones. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Gootjes, Albert. 'John Cameron and the French Universalist Tradition' in *The Theology of the French Reformed Churches: From Henri IV to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes,* ed. Martin I. Klauber, *Reformed Historical-Theological Studies.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014.

Hildebrand, Herman. *Orthodoxa Declaratio Articulorum Trium: De Mortis Christi Sufficientia et Efficacia, Reprobationis Causa Meritoria, Privata Denique Communionē, Conscio & instante venerando ministerio Bremensi, pro sopiendis inter quosdam collegat hinc exortis controversiis concepta, & in eodem*

- collegio ann. 1639. d. 4, & 3.* Bremae: Typis Bertholdi Villieriani, 1642.
- Hoard, Samuel. *Gods Love to Mankind, Manifested by Disproving His Absolute Decree for Their Damnation.* London: Printed for John Clark, 1673.
- Moore, Jonathan D. *English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Muller, Richard A. 'A Tale of Two Wills? Calvin, Amyraut, and Du Moulin on Ezekiel 18:23' in *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2012.
- _____. 'Dating John Davenant's De Gallicana Controversia Sententia in the Context of Debate over John Cameron: A Correction.' *Calvin Theological Journal.* 50 (2015), 10-22.
- _____. 'Davenant and Du Moulin' in *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2012.
- _____. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1995.
- _____. 'Review of "English Hypothetical Universalism: John Preston and the Softening of Reformed Theology".' (2008), 149-150.
- Rex, Walter. *Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy.* M. Nijhoff, 1965.
- Rouwendal, Pieter L. *Predestination and Preaching: In Genevan Theology from John Calvin to Benedict Pictet.* Kampen: Summum, 2016.

- _____. 'Doctrine of Predestination in Reformed Orthodoxy' in *A Companion to Reformed Orthodoxy*, Edited by Herman Selderhuis. BRILL, 2013.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993, Volume iii.
- Sinnema, Donald W. *The Issue of Reprobation at the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) in Light of the History of This Doctrine*. Unpublished Ph.D. University of St. Michael's College, 1985.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. *The Plan of Salvation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1977.

[초록]**존 다브네프의 하나님의 작정의 논리적 순서에 관한 입장 연구**

강효주

(진주화평교회, 부목사, 교회사)

이 소논문은 17세기 초에 도르트 총회에 영국 총대로 참석했던 존 다브네프(John Davenant)의 하나님의 논리적인 작정의 순서에 대한 입장에 관한 연구이다. 이 신학적 주제에 대한 다브네프의 입장은 그의 생애동안 한 번도 바뀌지 않았다. 특히 그가 참석했던 도르트 총회 전과 총회 기간동안, 그리고 총회 이후에도 그의 입장은 한결 같았다. 어떤 학자들은 다브네프가 작정의 논리적인 순서에 대해서 아미랄두스 주의의 입장을 취했다고 주장한다. 이 소논문에서는 그 교리에 관한 다브네프의 입장이 아미랄두스 주의(Amyraldianism)와 다르다는 것을 입증하려고 시도한다. 그것을 위해서 먼저 모이세 아미로(Moïse Amyraut)의 스승이었던 존 카메론(John Cameron)의 하나님의 작정의 논리적 순서에 대한 입장을 다브네프의 입장과 비교, 대조함으로써 구체적으로 무엇이 다른지를 분석한다. 그리고 다브네프의 신학적 견해가 도르트 신조의 입장과 일치하는지 살펴본다. 작정의 논리적 순서에 관한 존 카메론의 입장이 다브네프와 다른 점은 그리스도를 세상에 보내기로 한 작정이 택자들을 선택하는 작정보다 논리적으로 앞선다는 것이다. 다브네프는 하나님의 작정이 단순히 구원을 가능하게 만드는 것이 아니며, 하나님의 작정이 무산되는 것은 있을 수 없는 일이라고 믿었다. 작정의 논리적 순서에 관한 다브네프의 입장은 성경에 드러난 우주적인 복음 선포에 근거하고 있다. 결론적으로, 하나님의 작정의 논리적 순서에 관한 다브네프의 입장은 아미랄두스 주의와 다르고, 도르트 신조의 내용과 충돌되지 않으며, 17세기 초의 정통 개혁주의 입장에서 타락 후 선택설(infralapsarianism)에 가깝다.

키워드: 존 다브네프, 존 카메론, 도르트 총회, 타락전선택, 타락후선택, 아미랄두스주의