APPENDIX 4

A COMPARISON OF CAUSALITY IN ARMINIUS,
KUCHLINUS, AND GOMARUS

In Arminius

I. Causa Efficiens.
   A. Efficiens Primaria. Principalis.
   B. Efficiens Secundaria.
   C. Caussa impulsiva.
      1. Ἰατρική.4 Interne movens.
      2. Προκαταρκτική.5 Externe movens.
   D. Instrumentalis. Instrumentum.
      1. Ordinaria.
      2. Extraordinaria.
   E. Caussa exsecutrix. Administra.
   F. Obsignans. Conservans.
   G. Dispositiva.

1 Cf. the discussion on pp. 72–75. This table is not an exhaustive collation of every term used, but a basic representation intended to provide a general sense of the use of causality in these authors. The vocabulary is taken directly from the respective authors. The primary obstacle to an accurate interpretation is that the authors were not always explicit about the relationship among the various causes they mentioned. For definitions of some of the vocabulary of cause and effect, see Muller; DLGT; Altenstaig, Lexicon; LSJ.

2 Arminius’s use of causality is collated primarily from Disp. pub. XVIII; XX; Disp. priv. XL; XLII; L; De fide (1605); De iustificatione (1603); De bonis operibus (1603).

3 According to De bonis operibus (1603), iv–v, the efficiens secundaria is clearly distinct from the instrumentalis.

4 This participle from the verb προγεγυμένη means “preceding.”

5 This adjective means “predisposing.”

6 According to Disp. priv. L.vi–vii, the caussa exsecutrix is distinct from the causa impulsiva.

7 According to Disp. pub. XX.iii, the obsignans et conservans is identified distinctly from the causa efficiens primaria, impulsiva, and the instrumentum.

8 The causa dispositiva may correspond to Burgersdijk’s forma disponens, or, according to its position in Disp. priv. XLII.iii, may correspond to the προκαταρκτική.
II. Materialis. Materia.
   A. Materia in qua. Subjectum recipiens.\(^9\)
   B. Subjectum cui.
   C. Materia circa quam. Objectum.
   D. Remota.
   E. Propinquior.
   F. Proxima.

III. Forma.\(^{10}\)

IV. Finis.

\textit{In Kuchlinus}\(^{11}\)

I. Caussa Efficiens.
   B. Caussa Impulsiva.\(^{12}\)
      1. Προηγομένη.
      2. Προκαταρκτική. Materia circa quam, Objectum, Efficiens meritoria.\(^{13}\)
   C. Instrumentalis Caussa.
      1. Per quam.

---


\(^{10}\) Our authors rarely developed the formal cause with any precision. Exceptions include Gomarus, \textit{De iustificatione} (1609), xxxiii, \textit{forma communis et propria}, and Trelcatius, \textit{De iustificatione} (1606), xix, who speaks of \textit{negativa} and \textit{affirmativa} under formal cause. At any rate, the formal cause was kept comparatively simple.

\(^{11}\) Kuchlinus’s use of causality is collated primarily from \textit{De praedestinatione} (1600); \textit{De iustificatione}; \textit{De iustificationis} (1603); \textit{De conditionibus}.

\(^{12}\) According to Kuchlinus, \textit{De praedestinatione} (1600), xv, the “causa impulsiva” pertains to the efficient cause (“causa impulsiva, quae ad efficientem pertinet”), but also resembles the final cause (“finis”), which is “first by intention.” This statement demonstrates the overlap of the final with the efficient cause. This kind of overlap and interrelationship among the causes is not unusual, and shows some flexibility within the model.

\(^{13}\) Kuchlinus, \textit{De iustificatione}, ix, gives these alternate names for προκαταρκτική, again indicating the overlap among some of the causes.