

"Election and Covenant:
The Synod of Dort and Children Dying in Infancy"

by

W. Robert Godfrey, Ph.D.

Professor of Church History
Westminster Theological Seminary in California

The Synod of Dort (1618-1619) was an assembly of Reformed theologians from all over Europe who gathered in the Netherlands to defend the Reformed understanding of the grace of God. The Synod responded to a variety of Arminian criticisms raised against Reformed theology. The First Head of Doctrine of the Canons of Dort specifically presented the Reformed doctrine of predestination as an answer to the Arminian theology. Articles 1-16 and 18 developed the doctrine of election in a systematic, biblical and pastoral manner. But Article 17 comes as a surprise. It states:

Since we are to judge of the will of God from His Word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the covenant of grace, in which they together with the parents are comprehended, godly parents ought not doubt the election and salvation of their children whom it pleases God to call out of this life in their infancy (Gen. 17:7; Acts 2:39; 1 Cor. 7:14).¹

Article 17 is not integrally related to the doctrine of election as it is being developed in the other articles. It seems out of place. Our study will show, however, that this article answered a potentially damaging charge that had been made against Reformed theology in the Netherlands and spoke to a significant pastoral problem. But the article represents more than a footnote in the history of theology. Its significance goes beyond the intrinsic importance of the salvation of infants. Article 17 is a window through which we can see how the Reformed theologians at Dort understood the relationship between covenant and election. It is a specific application of that relationship. In declaring that the character of the covenant as revealed in Scripture assures Christian parents that their children dying in infancy are elect, the Synod asserted its confidence that election could be known through the covenant and that the covenant was grounded in election. The Synod's confidence reflected its biblical understanding of the relation between time and eternity, between human history and divine decrees, between the visible and the invisible church, between an external order and internal order, between the promise offered to faith and salvation applied to the elect. The fathers at Dort had a clear image of the relationship between the historical visible church, the community of faith supported by the ministry of the Word, the sacraments and discipline (the covenant) and God's eternal, sovereign purpose (election). A careful look at Article 17 gives us an opportunity to see more clearly their thinking on this important theme.

Two questions face us as we begin our study. First, what historical circumstances led the Synod of Dort to make this theological affirmation about covenant children in the first place? Second, what insight does this article give us into Dort's theology on the relation between covenant and election? Our task then is to trace the historical career of Article 17 and to penetrate to its theological core.

Historical Career

What, then, was the historical background to Article 17? The discussion of the salvation of infants was initiated in the Netherlands at least ten years before the Synod of Dort. It arose as part of the growing criticism directed against the Dutch theologian and Leiden professor, Jacobus Arminius. In 1608 an anonymous document was circulated in the Netherlands attributing in 31 articles various errors to Arminius and his colleague Adrian Borrius. Articles 13 and 14 maintained that Borrius had taught that "Original Sin will condemn no man. In every nation, all infants who die without actual sins are saved."¹ Arminius responded to these 31 articles in his "The Apology or Defense." This response possibly was circulated in manuscript form in 1609, the year of Arminius' death.²

In his "Apology" Arminius began his discussion of articles 13 and 14 by defending Borrius saying he had never publicly taught what the articles attributed to him, but had discussed such questions privately. Arminius maintained that there were theological arguments which seemed to substantiate the position attributed to Borrius and that the arguments must be answered before charges of heresy could be made. He acknowledged that ancient theology was against Borrius, but noted that it was also against his orthodox Reformed critics since ancient theology taught only baptized infants would be saved. He cited Franciscus Junius, one of his professorial predecessors at Leiden, as an orthodox theologian who agreed with Borrius and then concluded his discussion with this observation:

But since our brethren deny this inference, behold the kind of dogma which is believed by them. "All the infants of those who are strangers from the covenant are damned; and of the offspring of those parents who are in the covenant, some infants that die are damned, while others are saved." I leave it to those who are deeply versed in these matters, to decide, whether such a dogma as this ever obtained in any church of Christ.³

Arminius cleverly attempted to turn the tables on his Reformed opponents. They had raised against him his weak stand on original sin, opening him to the charge of Pelagianism. He responded by focusing attention away from himself and onto the Reformed view of children. Arminius implied that his Reformed opponents held a callous doctrine unknown in the church, namely that some covenant children dying in infancy are damned.¹

This issue, like most of those in Arminius' life, continued after his death late in 1609. Indeed, the issue of children dying in infancy surfaced very soon in the famous petition for toleration and protection that more than forty followers of Arminius signed in 1610, known to history as the Remonstrance. The most famous part of this Remonstrance was its five-point positive summary of Arminian or Remonstrant theology.² But the Remonstrance is a longer document also containing a five-point rejection of those teachings among the Reformed to which the Arminians particularly objected.³ The second point of the teachings rejected by the Arminians read:

That God (so others teach) who willed from eternity in himself to make a decree to choose some men and reprobate others, has considered the whole human race, not only as created, but also as fallen and depraved in Adam and Eve our first ancestors, and again cursed. Out of this fall and destruction he has determined to save some and to make them holy through his grace and to prove his mercy. And he determined to let others, the young as well as the old, indeed even some children of covenant members, and those baptized in the name of Christ, dying in childhood, remain in the curse through his righteous judgement, to the declaration of his righteousness. He determined both without regard for repentance and faith in the one or impenitence and unbelief in the others. For the accomplishment of these decrees God also uses such means through which the elect necessarily and unavoidably become holy and the reprobate necessarily and unavoidably must be lost.⁴

The Arminians had reiterated the charge first leveled by Arminius that the Reformed theology taught damnation for some covenant infants dying in infancy.

In 1611 the States of Holland arranged a conference at the Hague (the Collatio Hagensis) between the Reformed and the Arminians to discuss the issues dividing them as summarized in the Remonstrance. The conference began with the Arminians reiterating their own position and their critique of certain Reformed teachings—including their alleged teaching on covenant infants.

The Reformed responded to the Arminians with a statement and defense of their own position which came to be known as the Counter Remonstrance.⁹ They summarized their own theological position in seven points. Six of the points were basically directed to stating the Reformed alternative to the five positive points of the Arminians. The second point, however, responded to the second criticism of the Reformed in the Remonstrance. Clearly the Reformed were very sensitive on this matter of children and so in their brief statement declared:

that not only adults who believe in Christ and accordingly walk worthy of the gospel are to be reckoned as God's elect children, but also the children of the covenant so long as they do not in their conduct manifest the contrary; and that therefore believing parents, when their children die in infancy, have no reason to doubt the salvation of these their children.¹⁰

The centrality given this assertion shows that the Reformed were aware of the theological and especially pastoral importance of the question about covenant children. Especially in an era of high infant mortality the Reformed may have feared that the popularity of their cause would be damaged if the Arminian polemic went unchallenged.

The Arminians, in their reply to the Counter Remonstrants, gave thanks to God that the Reformed were not teaching the eternal loss of such covenant children. Yet the issue surfaced one more time at the Hague conference. The Counter Remonstrants stated sharply that "it is entirely untrue that it was taught by common preachers that some small children of covenant members, dying in infancy, would be left in the curse."¹¹ This declaration was one of several Counter Remonstrant efforts to answer continuing Arminian criticisms. It is further evidence of Reformed concern about the polemic damage that could be done to their cause by this issue.

At the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) the Arminians again raised the issue. Certain Arminians, summoned to judgment, were asked by the Synod to give their views of the theology of the Remonstrance. On the first article, dealing with predestination, the Arminians presented their opinions in ten points, the final two of which spoke of children. The Arminians affirmed in thesis nine:

All the children of believers are sanctified in Christ, so that no one of them who leaves this life before the use of reason will perish. By no means, however, are to be considered among the number of the reprobate certain children of believers who leave this life in infancy before they have committed any actual sin in their own persons, so that neither the holy bath of baptism nor the prayers of the church for them can in any way be profitable for their salvation.

Thesis ten said:

No children of believers who have been baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, living in the state of infancy, are reckoned among the reprobate by an absolute decree.¹¹

The theology of thesis nine is very similar to the Reformed statement on children in the Counter Remonstrance. The thesis is also similar to the language of the final form of the Canon's of Dort, I, 17 and the Conclusion of the Canons. Thesis ten declared that no children of believers were reprobate. Such a statement may have been designed, like many actions of the Arminians at Dort, to try and cause division among the delegates to the Synod. The Arminians knew that the issue of reprobation was a difficult one and by linking it in their thesis to the sensitive matter of covenant children they may have hoped to set the orthodox debating with one another. In any case, these Arminian theses clearly put the issue of covenant children before the Synod for its consideration. They forced the foreign delegates from Great Britain, Germany and Switzerland, who may have been unfamiliar with the issue as it had been debated in the Netherlands, to face the question.

The records of the Synod of Dort (reprinted in the Acta Synodi) enable us not only to read the final determination of the Synod as we find it in Canons of Dort I, 17, but also to see various preliminary expressions of opinions. The working procedure of the Synod had each delegation draft its own response to the Arminians. These opinions (or judicia) were used as a basis for the final Canons. Since the various responses were printed in the Acta, they show how each of the delegations addressed the issue of covenant children.

The delegations actually produced twenty-one sets of opinions on the question of election as raised in the first article of the Remonstrance.¹² Ten of these judicia did not deal with election in relation to children at all.¹⁴ The foreign delegations which were silent may not have been fully informed about the history of the discussion in the Netherlands.¹³ The silence of some Dutch delegations, however, is harder to understand. Perhaps some of the Dutch delegates were unwilling to allow the Arminians to set the agenda for all topics discussed. They may also have thought that the topic did not

deserve so much prominence.

Eleven Judicia (four foreign and seven Dutch) did speak to the issue of election and children. The British delegation rejected any notion that "there is no election of children dying before they have the use of reason."¹⁶ They argued that if the Arminians defined election in terms of foreseen faith, then infants could not be saved, but, the British affirmed, the Scripture showed that some infants were saved and elect. Arminian theology, they concluded, showed how one error led to another. The British did not go on to express their own positive opinion on the matter of the children of believers dying in infancy, which is somewhat surprising. The British were usually quite sensitive to the pastoral implications of theology. They clearly saw the absurdity of the Remonstrant thesis, but if it was thrown in as an apple of discord, the British did not bite. (The delegations of Utrecht and Overijssel took essentially the same position as the British. The same is also true of the letter to the Synod from Pierre DuMoulin.)

The Helvetian delegation (from German-speaking Swiss cities) also answered the Remonstrants saying that infants as well as adults were subject to election and reprobation. They expressed their views on covenant children in this way:

In respect to the infants of the faithful, since God by virtue of the covenant of grace is their God, and since Paul calls holy those children of at least one faithful parent, and since the Lord of heaven proclaims that such children are the heirs of the heavenly kingdom, if they should die in infancy before the years of discretion, we hope the best for them: We do not doubt that the angels, those ministers and most beloved spirits of that tender age, to whom God always exhibits his face, were especially sent forth for them and most promptly perform in their service.¹⁷

This language of the Helvetians was the most restrained of any of the delegations that spoke to this issue. In their own Judicium they did not speak as confidently as either the Arminians or the final form of the Canons. They did later, however, join with all other members of the Synod in endorsing the Canons of Dort.

The Nassau delegation expressed itself in language similar to that of the Canons: "Although God could damn infants on account of original sin, Christian parents ought by no means to doubt the salvation of their infants; because the promise was made to them and their children."¹⁸

The Bremen delegation also stated its confidence strongly:

We determine about the children of believers only that those who die before the age of doctrinal understanding are loved by God and are saved by the same good pleasure of God on account of Christ, through Christ, and in Christ as an adult: therefore they are holy from the relation of the covenant. The reality of which is confirmed by grace when they are initiated by sacred baptism and put on Christ.²⁹

The Dutch professors wrote:

There is a great difference between those infants born to parents in the covenant and those not born in the covenant...we conclude that the children of believers dying in infancy ought to be reckoned elect since they are graciously taken away by God from this life before they have violated the conditions of the covenant. We are of the opinion that the children of unbelievers born outside the church of God, ought to be left to the judgement of God. For "those who are outside, God will judge," 1 Corinthians 5:13.³⁰

This judgment was written by Johannes Polyander, Antonius Thysius and Antonius Walaeus. Their colleague, Sibrandus Lubbertus, expressed his agreement with their statement but went on to write his own statement. He did not go as far as his colleagues, but focused his response more particularly on answering the Arminians. He expressed himself in two theses: first, "some who are polluted only by original sin are passed over by God in eternal election,"³¹ and second, "there is election of some infants and reprobation of others." He supported this second thesis by saying of Acts 2:39, "the promise pertains to infants of the Church."³²

Professor Franciscus Gomarus also wrote his own theses on the first article. He was motivated to do so primarily by his own supralapsarianism which differed from the infralapsarianism of his four colleagues. On infants he wrote:

We piously believe that the infants of true believers, covenanted to God through Christ are also elect, if they die before the use of reason, from the formula of the covenant: I am your God and the God of your seed (Genesis 17 and Acts 2:39). But if they should attain the use of reason, we recognize only those to be elect who believe in Christ, indeed according to the Gospel, only these are saved.³³

The delegates from South Holland also spoke to this issue. One member of the delegation was Fransus Hommiss, the principal author of the Counter Remonstrance. Their judicium stated that all children were subject to damnation for original sin and that the children of believers reaching adolescence sometimes are reprobate. Further,

whether this same reprobation can be true of the children of believers dying in infancy without actual sins, they judge that it ought not to be curiously inquired into: but because the testimonies of Holy Scripture exist which destroy all occasion for faithful parents to doubt the election and salvation of their infants, they judge that they ought to be accepted: such as Genesis 17:7, Matthew 19:14, Acts 2:39, 1 Corinthians 7:14, and similar texts.²⁸

While the first part of the statement might appear to be equivocating, their concern was to avoid vain speculation and to rest their theology solely on biblical evidence. The language was as confident as that of the Canons.

Finally the delegates from Ovenbe judged that believing parents might have "certain hope" of salvation of their children dying in infancy based on the "good affection" of God revealed in Scripture.²⁹

The final form of the Canons of Dort I, 17 reflected many of the concerns expressed in the theses of the delegates. Article 17 reflected that the leadership of the Synod and the Synod as a whole believed that they needed to make a pastoral statement on the question of covenant children dying in infancy and that Reformed theology needed to vindicate itself against the false charges made by the Arminians. The form of the article demonstrated the Synod's concern to judge the issue on the basis of Scripture and its conviction that the Scripture was clear in testifying that the children of believers were holy on the basis of the covenant of grace. This covenantal relationship assured Christian parents that their children who died in infancy were saved and elect.

The Conclusion of the Canons returned to this subject. In rejecting certain doctrines falsely attributed to the Reformed, the Conclusion repudiated the teaching that "many children of the faithful are torn, guiltless, from their mother's breasts, and tyrannically plunged into hell: so that neither baptism nor the prayers of the Church at their baptism can at all profit them."³⁰ The Conclusion at this point, like the Canons throughout, rejected any notion of divine tyranny or that any were condemned guiltless or that the ministry of the church was useless. The language of the Conclusion in part was designed to react to the Arminian ninth thesis on the first article. In part that language was designed to reject any misuse of some celebrated words of John Calvin.

John Calvin's work in general certainly had a great influence on the delegates to Dort. But as they drew up the Conclusion one of his sentences in particular seems to have been of concern to them.

Calvin in his "De occulta dei providentia" did say against his critic Sebastian Castellio: "Put forth now thy virulence against God, who hurls innocent babes torn from their mother's breasts into eternal death."⁴⁷ B. B. Warfield accurately commented on this statement of Calvin: "The underlying conception that God condemns infants to eternal death seems to be Calvin's; but the mode of expression is Calvin's reductio ad absurdum (or rather ad blasphemiam) of Castellio's opinions."⁴⁸ Dort's conclusion made clear that the position attacked by the polemic sarcasm of Calvin was not the position of the Reformed theology. (It is interesting that Calvin's remark was made in reaction to Castellio's failure to understand the significance of original sin—the same theological point at which the controversy began in the Netherlands with Arminius.)

Indeed Calvin's position on the children of believers dying in infancy seems very similar to that of the Synod of Dort. While Calvin did not use language that was identical to that of Dort, various statements of his imply the same teaching. In his theology of baptism which promised a secure relationship to God for the children of believers he said: "We on the contrary argue that since baptism is the pledge and figure of the free forgiveness of sins and of divine adoption, it should certainly not be denied to infants, whom God adopts and washes with the blood of His Son,"⁴⁹ and "...by baptism they [children] are admitted into Christ's flock, and the symbol of their adoption suffices them until as adults they are able to bear solid food."⁵⁰ Even more strongly Calvin declared, "Therefore the grace of the Spirit will always be conjoined to baptism, unless a hinderance arise on our part."⁵¹

Calvin's assurance about the children of believers rested, at a deeper level, on the covenant which was the foundation of baptism:

Yet, (you say) there is danger lest he who is ill, if he die without baptism, be deprived of the grace of regeneration. Not at all. God declares that he adopts our babies as his own before they are born, when he promises that he will be our God and God of our descendants after us (Genesis 17:7). Their salvation is embraced in this word. No one will dare be so insolent toward God as to deny that his promise of itself suffices for its effect.⁵²

Calvin regarded his theology of children in the covenant as very important. In commenting on I Corinthians 7:14 he stated:

Therefore this passage is a noteworthy one, and based on the profoundest theology. For it shows that the children of believers are set apart from others by a certain special privilege, so that

they are regarded as holy in the Church... But the fact that the apostle ascribes a special privilege to the children of believers here has its source in the blessing of the covenant, by whose intervention the curse of nature is destroyed, and also those who were by nature unclean are consecrated to God by His grace.²⁷

Article 17 of the Canons of Dort is basically a specific application of the theology of baptism and covenant articulated by Calvin. Both stressed the special relationship that the children of believers on the basis of the covenant have to God. Both taught the salvation of such children dying in infancy. Article 17 shared Calvin's pastoral and theological position and spoke it clearly to the particular historical circumstances of the Netherlands.

Theological Core

We have traced the discussion about covenant children through its historical development in the Netherlands. We have seen how the Synod of Dort unanimously declared its judgment that Christian parents may be assured, on the basis of God's Word, that their children dying in infancy are elect and saved. This declaration met a serious historical challenge to Reformed theology and offered a comforting pastoral promise to parents. But beyond this specific comfort we want to look deeper into Dort's theology and ask how Article 17 was based on a particular understanding of covenant ^{and} election.

As we seek to understand Dort's theology of covenant and election we must be attentive to two of the vital questions that come to the minds of believers: first, how are we to be saved? and second, is that salvation available to us? The Reformed doctrine of election, Dort insisted, answered the first: from beginning to end it is the grace of God that saves. From the counsels of eternity where the elect were chosen, salvation is by grace. In the application of redemption in the justification, sanctification and glorification of the elect, all salvation is of God's sovereign, irresistible grace.²⁸ But now the second question arises: if election is fixed and certain in God, how can saving grace be truly available. Here, for Dort, was the place of the covenant. The covenant was God's revelation in history of the way of salvation. The covenant community in the New Testament age was the Church. Through the Church the

promise of saving grace was offered to faith and there assurance was given that every one who believed had salvation and was elect. The Canons of Dort proclaimed clearly the offer of salvation to all.¹⁵ They declared that the means for planting and nourishing faith were in the covenant community.¹⁶ And the Canons declared that as the Christian lived in the covenant community there were criteria whereby he could be assured of his salvation and election.¹⁷

Dort's theology then struck a fine balance between election and covenant. The Canons showed that grace was fully available in the covenant to everyone who believed and they assured everyone who truly believed that his salvation was sure and secure in God. In this balance Dort preserved Calvin's great reforming insights on salvation and maintained the confidence and comfort of Christianity. The Christian could know that he was saved and that God had done it. All doubts and threats—whether of human inability or divine exclusion—were removed for the faithful. The believer could know true peace with God. This assured peace was the proper possession of every Christian for himself¹⁸ and determined his relations with others who sincerely professed the faith.¹⁹ This assured peace was also the possession of all Christian parents who lost their children in infancy.

Conclusion

Dort's understanding of the relation of covenant and election was neither original nor exhaustive. Rather in the face of a great crisis Dort clearly restated these great doctrines of Reformed Christianity. Dort established for the Reformed the confessional parameters for further reflection on the great doctrines of grace. For the delegates to the Synod of Dort the relation between covenant and election was not problematic. Their reasoning was that those incorporated as infants into the covenant of grace sustained a saving relationship to God unless they later in life rejected that covenant. Since those dying in infancy could not reject the covenant, they must be elect and saved. Here is a simple, yet profound appreciation of the interrelationship of election and covenant. Election was not a matter of speculation or an unknowable threat. Election was always the certain foundation of salvation for God's

people—salvation clearly revealed in the provisions of God's covenant.

1. The text of the Canons of Dort can be found in Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, Grand Rapids, Michigan (Baker Book House), 1977, Vol. II, pp. 550-597; P.Y. DeJong, editor, Crisis in the Reformed Churches, Grand Rapids, Michigan (The Reformed Fellowship), 1968, pp. 230-262; and Psalter Hymnal, Grand Rapids, Michigan (Publication Committee of the Christian Reformed Church), 1959, pp. 44-66. For a modern translation of the Canons of Dort, see Psalter Hymnal, Grand Rapids, Michigan (CRC Publications), 1987, pp. 927-949. The scripture references, which are not cited by Schaff, do not appear in the official Latin text of the Canons, but are printed in the margin of the original Dutch text.

2. Quoted by Arminius in the 'Apology or Defense', The Writings of James Arminius, translated by James Nichols, Grand Rapids, Michigan (The Baker Book House), 1977, Vol. I, p. 317.

3. Carl Bangs, Arminius, Nashville (Abingdon Press), 1971, P.300.

4. Arminius, op. cit., p.321.

5. There are a number of studies on the history of the doctrine of infant salvation. The most useful for this study was B. B. Warfield, 'The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation', originally published in 1891, and reprinted in B. B. Warfield, Studies in Theology, New York (Oxford University Press), 1932, pp. 411-444. See also, R. A. Webb, The Theology of Infant Salvation, Harrisburg, Virginia (Sprinkle Publications), 1981 (reprinted from 1907) and Lewis Bevens Schenck, The Presbyterian Doctrine of Children in the Covenant, New Haven (Yale University Press), 1940. For a Roman Catholic discussion see, Peter Gumpel, S. J., "Unbaptized infants: May They be Saved?" The Downside Review, 72 #230 (Nov. 1964), 342-458. In Warfield's article he refers to Peter Martyr Vermigli as a Reformed author who was uncertain about the salvation of unbaptized covenant children dying in infancy, (p. 432). For references to the views of Bucer and Beza, see John Davenant, Baptismal Regeneration and the Final Preservation of the Saints, London (William Macintosh), 1864, pp. 16, 18.

6. See Schaff, op. cit., pp. 545-549 and DeJong, op. cit., pp. 207-209.

7. For a brief summary of this five-point rejection, see Schaff, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 516-517.

8. Translated from the text given in Jacobus Trigland, Kerklijke Geschiedenissen betreffende de geschillen in de Vereenigde Nederlanden voorgefallen, Leyden, 1650, p. 525.

9. Printed in DeJong, op. cit., pp. 211-213.

10. Ibid., p. 211.

11. Schriftelijke Conferentie, gehouden in s'Gravenhaghe inden jare 1611, s'Gravenhaghe, 1612, p. 38. This conference is better known in the literature as the Collatio Hagienis.

12. DeJong, op. cit., p. 224.

13. The Synod also received two letters from Reformed theologians that evaluated the Arminian theology. One was from Pierre Du Moulin (Acta Synodi Nationalis... Dordrechtii habitae Anno MDCXVIII et MDCXIX, Dordrecht, 1620, Part I, pp. 289-300) and the other from David Pareus (Acta Synodi, Part I, pp. 207-239).

14. The Palatinate, Hesse, Geneva, Embden, Gelderland, North Holland, Zealand, Friesland, Groningen, and the Walloon churches. The letter of David Pareus is also silent.

15. Yet some, David Pareus for example, were familiar with the printed material coming from the Collatio Hagensis.

16. Acta Synodi, Part II, p. 10.

17. ibid., Part II, p. 40.

18. ibid., Part II, p. 44.

19. ibid., Part II, p. 63.

20. ibid., Part II, pp. 10-11.

21. ibid., Part II, p. 20. This thesis may be a link to the origins of the controversy in the Netherlands if Bang's supposition (op. cit., p. 300.) is correct that Lubbertus was the author of the "Thirty-One Articles" against Arminius in 1608.

22. ibid. Polyander, Thysius and Walaeus also expressed their agreement with the statement of Lubbertus.

23. ibid., Part III, p. 24.

24. ibid., Part III, p. 39.

25. Acten ofte Handelingen des Nationalen Synodi... tot Dordrecht, Leiden, 1621, Part II, p. 120.

26. Schaff, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 596.

27. This is Warfield's translation (op. cit., p. 435, n. 78) and is much more accurate than the very loose translation of Henry Cole, Calvin's Calvinism, London (Sovereign Grace Union), 1927, p. 335. The Latin text of Calvin is in his Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia, Brunsvigae, 1870, Vol. 9, Col. 312.

28. Warfield, op. cit., p. 435.

29. John Calvin, Commentary on Matthew 19:14. (All quotations from Calvin's commentaries are from Calvin's New Testament Commentaries, A New Translation, edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, Grand Rapids, Michigan (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), 1973.)

30. John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, edited by J. T. McNeill, Philadelphia (The Westminster Press), 1960, IV, xvi, 31.

31. Commentary on Acts 2:38.

32. Institutes, IV, xv, 20.

33. Commentary on I Corinthians 7:14. See also Institutes IV, xv, 22 and IV, xvi, 9 and 15, and Commentary on Ezekiel 16:21, Acts 3:25, and Romans 11:22. See also John Calvin, Letters, edited by Jules Bonnet, New York (Burt Franklin Reprints), 1972, Vol. III, p. 73 where Calvin is consoling a Christian man whose child died unbaptized.

34. Canons of Dort, I, 6-11; III-IV, 10-14.

35. ibid., I, 3; II, 5; III-IV, 8.

36. ibid., I, 16; III-IV, 17; V, 14.

37. ibid., I, 12; V, 10.

38. ibid.

39. ibid., III-IV, 15.